THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE PURITAN PARTY, 1603-1643
A STUDY IN A LOST REFORMATION

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
JAMES F. MACLEAR

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
AUGUST, 1947

PREFACE

The following work represents a little more than a year's research in the history of Stuart Puritanism. In many ways the time has been inadequate. I cannot claim that this study is exhaustive, and I especially regret that I have not been able to investigate thoroughly the pamphlet literature. In addition, the sources available only in England would have to be studied, especially manuscripts which, in a "secret" history such as this, should bulk large. Whatever value this present study has is to open a field which I believe to be hitherto unexploited. Until a piece of exhaustive scholarship appears or until I have time to complete this requirement myself, this work may perhaps serve as an outline for one of the most important periods in the history of the English church.

In preparing this study I have received help from more men than I can hope to acknowledge. Of those who have given me special aid I would like to mention, first, the librarians of the Newberry Library and the University of Chicago. At the university I am especially indebted to the inter-library loan librarians and to the librarians of Swift Hall and Harper. To my readers, Mr. James Hastings Nichols and Mr. Sidney E. Mead, I owe much excellent criticism and advice. Though not directly connected with this thesis, Mr. John T. McNeill, now of Union Theological Seminary, first started me on these studies and introduced me to much of the background covered in these pages. Lastly, my greatest debt ~~is~~ to Mr. Winthrop Hudson, who has been my teacher, adviser, and friend for these last several years.

CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter

I. PROLOGUE: THE PURITAN PARTY UNDER ELIZABETH AND JAMES 9

II. THE NEW PURITAN PARTY: THE LAITY AND THE PARLIAMENT 28

III. THE NEW PURITAN PARTY: THE CLERGY AND THE PARLIAMENT 55

IV. THE ALLIANCE WITH BUCKINGHAM 81

V. THE LONG NIGHT AND THE DAWN: 1629-1640 116

VI. SOURCES OF PARTY STRENGTH: 1640-1642 147

VII. TRIUMPH OF THE PARTY: THE RELIGIOUS REVOLUTION 198

VIII. THE DISINTEGRATION OF PURITANISM AND THE PURITAN PARTY 234

IX. EPILOGUE: THE EMERGENCE OF LAY OPPOSITION 290

BIBLIOGRAPHY 329

INTRODUCTION

Few religious movements in history have made an impact on the course of civilization surpassing that of Puritanism. Beginning in the sixteenth century and flourishing throughout the seventeenth, Puritanism dominated the English and New England scenes just at the moment when many of the most distinctive aspects of contemporary society were becoming fixed. The triumph of capitalism, the drastic limitation of absolutism, the rise of religious diversity, the recognition of the principle of toleration, and the characteristic humor of the Puritan mind with its emphasis on duty, responsibility, and seriousness and its hatred of frivolity--all these were either partial products of the Puritan movement or closely connected with it, and all these are very much in evidence in the Anglo-Saxon world today. Yet it is a striking illustration of the historical moral than "man proposes, God disposes" that hardly any of the Puritan-derived characteristics of modern civilization are in harmony with the original aims of the movement. On the contrary, it is not too bold to state that most of the present-day fruits of Puritanism would have been (and actually were) bitterly denounced by the Puritan clergy. Rather, it was for objectives almost directly opposite to its contemporary manifestations that Puritanism was contending.

To a considerable extent, the Puritan aims can be summed up in the term "reformation." Despite efforts to establish the contrary, it is undeniable that the Puritans were principally, though not exclusively, concerned with religion. Throughout their period of growth and predominance, the Puritans were in a very real sense striving for that thorough reformation of the church which England had somehow missed in the middle of the sixteenth century. Fondly gazing at the ideal systems of their Reformed brethren on the Continent and in Scotland, the Puritans could not believe that Anglicanism was more than temporary, and consequently they labored to terminate an incongruous ecclesiastical situation by forcing the government to establish some sort of consistently Protestant church, purged of all the vestiges of Rome.

This desire for a more thorough-going reformation manifested itself primarily in the Puritan demand for a Reformed type of service and for some sort of Reformed-New Testament type of polity. In the early history of the movement, there was no quarrel over doctrine, but after the turn of the century, the rise of Arminianism among the Anglicans brought an additional quasi-Roman characteristic to the established church which the Puritans felt called upon to eradicate. Closely connected with the desire for a Puritan polity was the impulse to erect a church with both the zeal and the power to create a religious commonwealth which in time might hope to rival John Knox's description of Geneva as "the maist perfyt schoole of Chryst that ever was in the erth since the dayis of the Apostillis."[1] Implicit in this proposal was an elevated clerical conception combined with a suggestion of that theocratic holy commonwealth which was to develop in the free conditions of Massachusetts. Imbued with these principles, the Puritans felt increasingly called upon to protest against the obvious Erastianism of the Elizabethan Settlement, not indeed in favor of a "free" church--such an idea was completely alien to the first half of the seventeenth century--but in favor of an independent church bestowing the benefit of its instruction upon a resonably docile state, at least as far as religious affairs were concerned.[2]

---

[1] The Works of John Knox, ed. David Laing, IV (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1855), 240. See also Knox's eulogy of the Genevan discipline (ibid., V [Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1856], 211-216).

By 1660 the Puritan dream of realizing these objectives had forever disappeared. By that time the long-expected reformation had still to be accomplished, and judicious Puritans could see that in all probability it never would be. The Puritan condemnation of Anglican doctrine and polity was largely repudiated and Anglicanism firmly established as the predominant church in England. Even more so were the Puritan ministers' pretensions to clerical rule overthrown. Rather than an independent state church, the Puritans were obliged to witness an exercise of Erastianism in the Established Church such as the first two Stuarts had not dreamed of. Perhaps even more humiliating than this was the fact that the Puritans saw all around them a seemingly endless partitioning of their party into a vast number of minute sects, and these clamoring for the toleration which the ante-bellum Puritans had so thoroughly despised. The most significant reaction to Puritanism and the upheaval which it had produced, however, was the trend of the new age which followed the Puritan Era toward increasingly secular interests; and in so far as it was religious at all, it displayed Latitudinarian characteristics. Thus, as far as the realization of ends was concerned, the Puritan movement could not have resulted in a more complete fiasco. And this is even more astonishing in view of the fact that Puritanism had supported the winning side in the Civil Wars and had ostensibly been in power during the score of years preceding 1660.

---

[2] See A. F. Scott Pearson, Church and State (Cambridge: University Press, 1928).

The fall of Puritanism, then, was a double failure. Not only did it help to produce conditions with which it was completely out of sympathy, but it failed to implement its program when it was in a position to do so. That it failed in this manner was due, not so much to outside opposition, as to the nature of the Puritan movement itself. To a large extent the failure is to be attributed to the fact that throughout the reign of Charles I and very rapidly after 1642, Puritanism was the subject of widespread self-disintegration--a process which has not yet been adequately explored by historical research.[3] By means of this development, Puritanism was transformed from a strong, well-unified, religious movement, enjoying a powerful dynamic and commanding the allegiance of the middle-class population into a multiplicity of small sects, without unity, without power, and without the confidence of its more stable supporters. Needless to say, this process immensely weakened and dissipated Puritan strength to the extent that Puritanism as anything more than an attitude of mind virtually disappeared.

Of equal importance, however, as a cause of the failure of the Puritan program was the fact that Puritanism in the course of its history had gradually come to be subjected to a connection with the powerful middle classes. This connection was represented both in the rising lay leadership within the Puritan party and in the alliance which the frustrated reformers made with the other elements of the parliamentary opposition. In its early years, Puritanism had been dominated by the clerical element, and the

---

[3] A good exposition of this fragmentation mentality may be found in William York Tindall, John Bunyan, Mechanick Preacher (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), pp.3-21.

Puritan ministers remained influential leaders throughout the history of Puritan reform agitation. As time passed, however, the continual frustration of the party by the government acted in such a way as to curtail effectively the clerical leadership. On the one hand, the English mind was always latently anti-clerical, and as the movement spread and as pietistic individualism took hold, the ministerial guidance was naturally and without conscious antagonism displaced. On the other hand, there was the intensely practical consideration that the rise of the parliament as the sole hope of the Puritans tended to thrust leadership upon the Puritan laymen since clergymen had long been excluded by law from the house of commons. This rising importance of the lay element in the party brought about something of a transformation in the aims and character of the Puritan movement, detaching it from its exclusive preoccupation with religion and uniting it through personal bonds to middle-class ambitions. In a similar way, Puritanism was influenced by its alliance with the middle-class opposition forces in the parliament. In its youth, Puritanism, following Protestantism's usual practice during the Reformation, had hoped to win the civil power and then with its aid impose the new order on the nation. In England, however, the magistrate was consistently unsympathetic, and the Puritans were forced to organize an opposition. When this opposition was allied with the political and economic grievances in the parliament, Puritanism became inextricably associated with extra-religious causes.

With this development, Puritanism became closely identified with the middle-class objectives--a union that was at once the source of its triumph and its downfall. For while this alliance permitted Puritanism to ride to power with the victorious bourgeoisie in the Civil Wars, the new powers in England were by and large as much out of sympathy with the Puritan objectives as had been Charles and Laud. Above all, they hated the idea of an efficient clericalism such as Presbyterianism would introduce, and consequently they effectively sabotaged the provisions of the Solemn League and Covenant. The English squirearchy and the new capitalism had not wrested the control of the central government from the Stuarts to submit their actions to the review of a theocracy. On the contrary, they quickly became disgusted with the religious chaos of the Interregnum and came to advocate toleration, though for expediential rather than metaphysical reasons. After this crisis of the Interregnum period had been decided against Puritanism's aspirations for a powerful, national church, Puritanism began to lose its raison d'être and became increasingly permeated with secular elements. It is to this later period that the well-known interpretations of such analysts as R. H. Tawney chiefly apply.[4]

It was in the quarter-century preceding the Civil Wars, however, that the union between the older Puritanism and its newer adherents and parliamentary allies finally took shape, and it is largely this period which is dealt with in this work. After the devastating disappointment of the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, Puritanism tended to go underground, and although doubtless there was some clandestine political activity, Puritanism as a political factor did not become really important until the later parliaments of James. Yet by the end of 1623 the Puritan complexion of the parliament had become sufficiently pronounced to attract the support of Buckingham to the movement. When in the course of several years of co-operation, the duke clearly indicated that though he was willing to satisfy the religious grievances to a certain extent, he was not inclined to cater to the other elements in the opposition, Puritanism had reached a point at which it was forced to come to a decision. When it finally elected to array itself in the forces of the opposition, Puritanism definitely showed that it was attached to the entirety of the parliamentary cause. Because of this fact, the history of the Puritan-Buckingham alliance is of grave importance: it was the last great effort on the part of the Puritans to accomplish the cherished reformation by converting the crown, and its failure completed the process of cementing the Puritan movement to the forces expressing the economic and constitutional discontent of the middle classes.

---

[4] Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1926), pp. 133-273.

Once this question had been decided, the Puritans joined the parliamentary opposition in earnest and concentrated all their attention on securing the downfall of the Laudian church and the surrender of the Stuarts' pretensions to absolutism. In carrying out this end, they had several advantages. In the first place, they naturally had the unstinting co-operation of the whole opposition force of the parliament. But in addition, the Puritan party had become immeasurably strengthened in itself. The alliance with Buckingham, temporary though it was, had brought the Puritans into a political prominence from which they only partially receded after the fall of the alliance. The Puritans, moreover, had the benefit of the tactlessness of the government's ecclesiastical policy as directed by Laud and the Anglo-Catholic party. Thanks to this fact, the Puritans managed to appear, not as contumacious nonconformists, but as the defenders of Protestant orthodoxy against the machinations of a secretly Catholic hierarchy. This new strength was considerably re-enforced by the development in the period from 1625 to 1629 of techniques which succeeded in bringing the Puritan influence in parliament to the point of its greatest effectiveness. By reason of all of these developments, the parliaments of the third decade of the century took on the aspect of a sort of rehearsal for the great events beginning in 1640 when the Puritans, having lifted their organization and influence to their highest points, succeeded in razing the Anglican Establishment. It was only after that church had been destroyed and the Puritan clergy had vainly attempted to erect a Puritan Establishment in its stead that they began to realize that the reformation had come too late. Only then did they begin to see that their original objectives were to be considerably warped by the fragmentation of Puritanism, by the rise of a vigorous anticlericalism, and by the triumph of the more profane aims of those with whom they had entered into coalition.

CHAPTER I

PROLOGUE:

THE PURITAN PARTY UNDER ELIZABETH AND JAMES

On the twenty-fourth of March, 1603, the old queen died. To her successor, James VI of Scotland, she left a host of problems which were to assume ever greater significance as the new century advanced. These Elizabeth had never really attempted to solve, but Tudor tact and good sense on the one hand and on the other popular love and respect for the aging Gloriana, the champion of '88, combined to prevent any serious breach between the crown and the nation. When James ascended the throne, however, the ties of sympathy and restraint were sundered. As a foreigner, as a doctrinaire, even as a man, he was to have far more difficulty than his predecessor in facing the problems of the previous reign.

One of the most important of these issues was the question of the church. In 1603, despite years of futile agitation, the English Reformation was still arrested, and the English church stood in the same place it had occupied forty years before. Yet for most of this period the Puritan forces had commanded the support of the most prominent and most powerful elements in the nation. For years, the Elizabethan Settlement was regarded simply as a measure of policy, and it was only toward the end of the reign that a loyalty to Anglicanism as such began to emerge. Throughout the critical period it was only the adamantine resistance of the queen that prevented the establishment of a true Reformed church in England, and as a consequence, during her last decade English Puritans looked forward to the accession to the throne of the Presbyterian king of Scotland. James, however, had been taught something about the agreement between Presbyterianism and monarchy, and the new dynasty looked on Puritanism with as little favor as had the old. After a short period of indulgence, he adopted a policy of repression which led to the virtual extinction of Elizabethan Puritanism as a party. During the next two decades, there was a steady growth of Anglicanism while the Puritan movement gradually lost ground. It was only after James's death that the folly of his son and the extravagances of resurgent Anglicanism combined to stimulate the rapid growth of Stuart Puritanism.

In many respects, the history of the Puritan party parallels that of the movement as a whole. Even at the very beginning the tendency toward party organization was manifested. The English refugees driven to the Continent by Mary's Catholic regime split into two factions on the issue of retaining the settlement of Edward VI or of adopting a system more consonant with the Continental Reformed models. The bitter bickering between the two groups at Frankfort and elsewhere was the seed of the much more extended ecclesiastical strife which was to dominate the English scene for the next century.[1] When the news arrived that Elizabeth was on the throne, John Knox and the Geneva group tried to secure unity among all the Continental exiles, for "if we . . . . hold fast together, it is most certain that the enemies shall have less power; offenses shall sooner be taken away; and religion best proceed and flourish."[2] The effort failed, however, and when the Protestant exiles came back to England it was as individuals, rather than as a united party. The result was that Elizabeth was able to raise a church after her own wishes. The more conservative leaders of the exiles she domesticated by appointing them to bishoprics, while the radicals were suppressed. After this victory over an incipient Puritan party, the queen dedicated herself to maintaining the status quo.

---

[1] The best volume on the Marian exiles is Christina Hallowell Garrett, The Marian Exiles (Cambridge: University Press, 1938). See also M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939), pp. 118-148.

[2] A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort, ed. Arber (London, 1908), p. 224, quoted in Knappen, pp. 164-165.

But the sentiment for a thorough reformation could not be downed so easily. After this rebuff from the crown, the Puritan lines were gradually reformed for an attack through other channels. In 1563 a full-scale Puritan program was introduced into convocation, only to be defeated by a narrow margin of one vote through the queen's influence.[3] But Elizabeth had evidently taken alarm, and the next year saw the inauguration of the repressive policy which developed into the Vestiarian Controversy. It was not until the early 1570's that the party returned to another vigorous attack. In 1571 Puritan petitions again flooded the convocation while Wentworth and Strickland led the assault in the increasingly Puritan house of commons. But again the queen halted the Puritan campaign, and when in the following year a number of leading Puritan ministers met and outlined a literary appeal to public opinion, prompt action was taken against the ringleaders.[4]

Although efforts of this sort were continually being made throughout the reign, the flood-tide of party activity came in the later 1580's. In 1586 a number of Puritan members, dominated by the irrepressible Wentworth, met "before the parliament" and "had sundry conuencions for the preferring in parliament a booke touching the rites of the church and a forme of an Acte for establishing of the same, which also they did printe preferre and urge in parliament."[5] At the same time the Puritan ministers were also making strenuous efforts. In 1584 the Dedham Classis decided on a fast for the coming parliament and ordered that "some of best creditt and most forward for the gosple shuld goe up to London to solicite the cause of the Churche."[6] This practice was apparently quite general during these years. Bancroft, the future archbishop, noted that on one occasion a survey was taken that the parliament "might have a generall viewe of all the ministers in England that impugned their desires," while at the same time the minister-deputies in London were to "offer disputation . . . . and to undertake any other such matter, as should then and there be determined of amongst them."[7] Fuller knew of this London Puritan synod in the year 1585, though he confessed to a certain vagueness, since it was "better discovered by their moving than by their meeting, and their practices more conspicuous than their places." He knew, however, that despite their "clandestine, arbitrary, and changeable" meeting, "some agents for them were all day at the door of the parliament-house, and some part of the night in the chambers of parliament-men, effectually soliciting their business with them."[8]

---

[3] Knappen, pp. 184-185.

[4] Ibid., pp. 226-235.

---

[5] J. E. Neale, "Peter Wentworth," The English Historical Review, XXXIX (1924), 50, quoting British Museum, Additional MSS, 5123, fol. 18 b.

[6] Roland G. Usher (ed.), The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth ("Royal Historical Society Publications," Third Series, VIII [London, 1905]), 40.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[8] Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain, from the Birth of Jesus Christ until the Year MDCXLVIII (London: Thomas Tegg, 1842), III, 73.

But like its predecessors, this parliamentary campaign was brought to nought through the efforts of the watchful sovereign, and in 1586 the Puritan champions in the commons soon found themselves in the Tower.[9]

The party had little better luck in a project of the same period--this time a daring attempt to transform the church within the outward framework of Anglicanism. This was the famous Classis Movement. Throughout England there existed a number of Puritan parishes that had a semi-Presbyterian organization with the churchwardens transformed into a sort of session. Under the organizing genius of the London minister, John Field, these were brought together into a national framework, classes were organized, provincial synods were set up, and the national assembly already referred to was called to meet during sessions of parliament. But in the midst of the organizing process, Field died, and with his hand removed, both party and project tended to disintegrate. A split soon appeared between the Puritan moderates and radicals, and after the publication of the seditious Martin Marprelate tracts and the exposure of the whole movement by Bancroft, the government began proceedings against the leaders.[10]

With the collapse of the Classis Movement and the continual frustration of the attempts at a parliamentary reformation the party was perforce obliged to settle down to wait for the death of the queen. The failure of the great efforts of the late eighties combined with internal dissension and external pressure administered blows from which the Elizabethan Puritan party never seems to have recovered. The result was that the movement went into a long, gradual decline from which it was resurrected only in the later days of James. Fuller characterized the period as well as any modern historian has been able to do:

---

[9] Neale, The English Historical Review, XXXIX (1924), 49.

[10] Knappen, pp. 293-294.

> After a storm comes a calm. Wearied with a former blustering, they began now to repose themselves in a sad silence, especially since the condemnation of Udall and Penry had so terrified them, that, though they might have secret designs, we meet not their open and public motions.[11]

With the coming of James to the English throne the situation did not alter. For a short while during the first year of his reign, James showed some signs of sympathy with the movement, and all the old party machinery was called into play again in connection with the Millenary Petition and the Hampton Court Conference.[12] By his action at the conclusion of the Hampton Court Conference, however, the king soon showed his true opinions of Presbyterianism, and the old Elizabethan policy was renewed. Under the leadership of the new archbishop, Bancroft, Anglicanism was strengthened in the convocation of 1604, and by a number of deprivations Puritan elements were driven out of the church or forced to make their peace.[13]

Thus, for the next twenty years the church was untroubled by serious religious disputes. To be sure, some sort of Puritan party activity may have been going on, but, as Fuller said, it did not rise to the surface and was probably not important. One reason for this period of silence between Tudor Puritanism and Stuart Puritanism was the fact that many of the old leaders seem to have died off at the same time that Elizabeth passed away. The two chief leaders of the party, Cartwright the theologian and Field the organizer, did not live to guide the party in the next reign, and though Stephen Egerton attempted to fill the loss, he too lapsed into inactivity after the Hampton Court fiasco. The policy of repression also did its work. Aside from the universal horror of being driven into separatism, there was the consideration that deprivation constituted a very serious financial blow to most divines. Doubtless some Puritan leaders like John Burges could return to studies and take up medicine, but few could hope to emulate him.[14] James, moreover, prided himself on knowing how to temper justice with mercy, and some efforts were actually made to mitigate the harshness of the sentence and to induce recalcitrants to conform. Perhaps most important of all was the fact that Anglicanism was becoming more palatable to the nation. The day was past when the _via_ _media_ could still be regarded as an impossible halting-place on the road to reformation. Anglicanism had produced its learned apologists, its Jewel and Hooker. But it was much more significant that it had produced its Sir Thomas Browne--a manifestation of devoted loyalty on the part of the laity. Time was doing its work, and some sections of the English people were beginning to experience a conservative love for Anglican ritual and liturgy and to regard the Puritans as captious innovators who would introduce into England a foreign discipline. All this was given a special impetus by the fact that the foreign danger had largely disappeared and with it the necessity for indulging Puritanism at the expense of Catholicism. Thus, both the individual and the government alike could afford to take a more detached view of religious strife. And lastly, this favorable situation was still unmarred by any taint of heterodoxy. Arminianism and Anglo-Catholicism were slowly making their way into the Anglican fold, but as yet the church was strongly

---

[11] Fuller, III, 152-153.

[12] Knappen, pp. 317-328.

[13] See Roland G. Usher, The Reconstruction of the English Church (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1910).

---

[14] Augustus Jessopp, "John Burgess," _Dictionary of National Biography_, ed. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, Vol. III (1921-22).

Calvinist. James's two archbishops, Bancroft and Abbot, and the king himself were all unimpeachably orthodox. The result was that during the first two decades of James's reign until 1623, when public excitement over the Spanish match marked a change, the history of Puritanism was, on the whole, uneventful. Such at any rate is the conclusion of the closest historian of the period, Samuel Rawson Gardiner.

> For the first time since the early days of the Reformation the Nonconformists were reduced to insignificance. There were no longer any voices raised loud enough to make themselves heard in favour of a change in the ritual of the Church. There were, for the first time, two parties opposed indeed in theology and in practice, but both declaring themselves to be ready to take their stand upon the Book of Common Prayer . . . . . Amongst the laity especially there was a large and increasing body which took no part with the fanatics on either side, but which was growing in piety and in moral progress under the influence of both.[15]

Despite this lingering decline of the movement, there were forces at work which guaranteed that Puritanism would not be extinguished. Throughout the length and breadth of England, Puritan ministers and lecturers were at work slowly winning whole districts and classes to the Puritan cause. In an extended study William Haller has examined the tremendously effective propaganda of the Puritan pulpit and press and demonstrated that it was this quiet building up of strength that was the basis of later Puritan victories.[16] "And the silenced Disciplinarians (as then they were called)," wrote Baxter, "did by their Writings, their secret Conference and Preaching, and their Godly Lives, work much upon such as were religiously addicted."[17] The Puritan message, moreover, was the more easily received because there was a widespread disposition, if we may believe Baxter, toward liturgical simplicity and economy. "There is," he noted,

---

[15] History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891), III, 252-253.

[16] The Rise of Puritanism (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938).

> (I know not perfectly whence), among the most of the Religious serious People of these Countreys, a suspicion of all that is Ceremonious in God's Service, and of all which they find not warrant for in Scripture, and a greater inclination to a rational convincing earnest way of Preaching and Prayers, than to the written Forms of Words which are to be read in Churches. And they are greatly taken with a Preacher that speaketh to them in a familiar natural Language and exhorteth them as if it were for their Lives.[18]

With such a tendency there was still a basis for an important Puritan future in the English church. Above all, there was sufficient party spirit in Puritanism so that the movement retained a consciousness of a mission distinct from that of the surrounding Protestantism. James never had any trouble in distinguishing Puritans from Calvinist Anglicans, and the Venetian ambassador was always careful to note the difference between the Puritan party and the "Protestant." Moreover, the Puritan cause commanded the allegiance of two of the most powerful groups in the nation--the justices of the peace and the house of commons.

All these factors formed a solid, continuing basis for the erection of a revived Puritan party, though for the time being the tide was running too strongly against Puritanism to permit any aggressive party activity. Yet this does not mean that Puritanism was entirely quiescent. It could still resist the repressive policies of the government wherever its own existence was endangered. Whether by protesting some injustice in a petition, marshalling public opinion in daring sermons, or embarrassing the king in the house of commons, the Puritan movement gave proof of its continuing vitality.

---

[17] Reliquiae Baxterianae or Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times (London: T. Parkhurst, J. Robinson, J. Lawrence, and F. Dunton, 1696), Part I, p. 32.

[18] Ibid.

The Puritan petition was called into extensive use shortly after the accession of James to the throne. The wholesale deprivations which he threatened to carry out raised a flurry of party activity to save the ministry. The Puritan clergy were essential to the movement, and it was realized that without their presence the movement would either be forced into separatism or into virtual extinction. As a consequence, during the latter part of 1604 and the beginning of 1605 local Puritan groups presented petitions to the king praying that the ministers be permitted to remain in their cures. Some of these petitions evidently emanated from the clergy themselves, and we know that the nonconforming ministers of Warwickshire prayed James to avert their threatened suspension, promising to subscribe to the king's supremacy and to conduct themselves peaceably.[19] But the laity were also aroused. In Lancashire, the justices despatched a message to the king in which they prayed "that the ministers, who have long and usefully laboured among them, may not be displaced for non-conformity."[20] The most important of these petitions, however, was that presented by the justices and gentlemen of Northamptonshire. This paper not only warned the king that the deprivations would be a cause of "great spiritual loss and mischief," but also told him frankly that if he proceeded on his course he would lose the affection of some thousands of his subjects.[21] At this thinly veiled threat, the king

---

[19] Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I, Vol. VIII (1603-10) (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1857), p. 193.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 175.

> took such a deep impression, as the next day, being Sunday, he sat eight howers in council with the Lords. In this Meeting he first most bitterly inveighed against the Puritans; saying, that the Revolt in the Lowe Countries, which hath lasted ever since he was borne, and whereof he never expected to see an end, began first by a Petition for matter in Religion, and so did all the Troubles in Scotland. That his Mother and He from their Cradles had been haunted with a Puritan Devil, which he feared would not leave him to his Grave: and that he could hazard his Crown but he would suppresse those malicious Spirits.[22]

The result of these fulminations was that an investigation was held which disclosed that Sir Francis Hastings, a strongly Puritan member of parliament, was the author. Hastings's fault was rendered even greater by the fact that as a Somerset man, he was meddling in the affairs of another county. After an examination of the offender, the council pronounced the petition "factious and seditious" and exiled Hastings to his country house.[23] The actual signers of the petition were imprisoned, though not for long.[24] This reaction seems to have halted any further petitions, however, and James threateningly secured an opinion from his judges as to the legality of punishing petitioners on behalf of deprived ministers.[25]

A much more important means of Puritan resistance was the sermon. Throughout the reign of James, Puritan preachers were delivering themselves in such a way as constantly to alarm the government. Fuller's judgment was that "some meddled with state-matters; and generally, by an improper transposition, the people's duty was preached to the king at court; the king's to the people in the country."[26] Occasionally, however, when Puritan ministers found the opportunity, it was the king's duty that was preached to the king. In 1604 John Burges preached before James and so infuriated him that he was cast into prison. In his letter imploring release, he confessed his errors but also stoutly insisted that "his concience compelled him to make the remarks on religion, because of the growth of Popish ceremonies and the displacing of hundreds of godly ministers."[27] A few years later in 1607, James was angered by the fact that preachers were daring to preach against the peace with Spain just concluded.[28] At times James could be singularly vindictive with regard to celebrated Puritan ministers, and in 1614 we find him sending to the bishop of Peterborough to certify a rumor that two great preachers were operating in the diocese.[29]

---

[21] Ibid., p. 193; Knappen, pp. 327-328.

[22] Henry Ellis (ed.), Original Letters, Illustrative of English History, Second Series (London: Harding and Lepard, 1827), III, 216.

[23] Cal.S.P., Dom., Jas.I, Vol. VIII (1603-10), p. 194.

[24] Ibid., p. 200.

[25] Ibid., p. 194.

During the latter part of the reign, the growing unpopularity of Stuart domestic and foreign policy multiplied the opportunities for Puritan political homiletics. Some of these sermons may have been merely attempts to court popularity by exploiting issues between the parliament and the court. Such, for instance, may have been the purpose behind the denunciations of impositions by a preacher at Paul's Cross.[30] But on such issues as the war in the Palatinate or the Spanish marriage for Prince Charles,

---

[26] Fuller, III, 318.

[27] Cal.S.P., Dom., Jas.I, Vol. VIII (1603-10), p. 127.

[28] Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, Vol. XI (1607-10) (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1904), p. 6.

[29] Cal.S.P., Dom., Jas.I, Vol. IX (1611-18) (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Robert, 1858), p. 254.

[30] Ibid., p. 461.

Puritan ministers felt that they had a real call to warn against the advance of Catholicism. As early as 1617 the lord mayor of London and his aldermen were treated to a strong denunciation of the Spanish match in one of the Spital sermons,[31] and as the marriage became more imminent these increased to a torrent. The Venetian ambassador thought some preachers had expressed "seditious and most dangerous opinions . . . . both privately and publicly,"[32] while another observer noted that the clergy refused to obey the king's orders not to discuss the marriage.[33] Perhaps most annoying to James was John Everard, a forerunner of the later Puritan mystics. He preached continually and fearlessly against the marriage with the Infanta "when others durst but whisper their consciences and thoughts." He was in and out of prison so often that James exclaimed in exasperation, "What is this Dr. Everout you come so oft about? His name hence forth on my soul . . . . shall be Dr. Neverout and not Dr. Everout."[34]

In 1623 the situation had become so alarming that the king issued strict orders on preaching. By these commands all afternoon lectures were to be abolished, and ministers were forbidden to preach on the "deep points" of predestination and election or on the limits of "the Power, Prerogative, and Jurisdiction, Authority, or Duty, of Sovereign Princes, or otherwise meddle with matters of State."[35] Yet these prohibitions do not seem to have been an insuperable obstacle to preachers practiced in the arts of suggestion and innuendo. "Our godliest preachers," said Tom Tell-Troath,

---

[31] [Thomas Birch] (ed.), The Court and Times of James the First (London: Henry Colburn, 1848), II, 10.

[32] Cal.S.P., Venet., Vol. XVII (1621-23) (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1911), p. 445.

[33] Cal.S.P., Dom., Jas.I, Vol. X (1619-23) (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1858), p. 201.

[34] Godfrey Davies, "English Political Sermons, 1603-1640," The Huntington Library Quarterly, III (1939-40), 10. I am indebted to this valuable article for several of these references to the sermon opposition.

> do allready pray against the evil day [of Catholic toleration], with so much earnestness as if that were at hande. And though there be orders given to preach nothing but courte divinitie, yet a man may easily perceive, by the very choyce of their texts, and the very teares in their eyes, that if they durst, they would speak their consciences.[36]

Frequently they did succeed in speaking their consciences, though but indirectly. When the prince went to Spain, some ministers prayed "God to be merciful unto him now that he was going into the house of Rimmon,"[37] while another preacher after speaking of apostacy, refused to go on to the applications on the ground that they were politically dangerous.[38] Although Biblical symbols were certainly the most numerous, others were used. Sir Simonds D'Ewes records how a preacher at Paul's Cross "cited a story out of our Chronicles, of a Spanish sheep, brought into England in Edward the First's time, which infected most of the sheep of England with a murrain, and prayed God no more such sheep might be brought over from thence hither; at which many of his hearers cried out 'Amen'."[39] At times, as when James required the divines to read the Book of Sports in 1618, the pulpit protest became so excited that the king had to forebear pushing his commands.

---

[35] John Rushworth (ed.), Historical Collections (London, 1721-1722), I, 65.

[36] Tom Tell-Troath: or a Free Discourse Touching the Manners of the Time, in A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts, on the Most Interesting and Entertaining Subjects, ed. Walter Scott, II (London: T. Cadell, W. Davies, W. Miller, R. H. Evans, J. White, J. Murray, J. Harding, 1809), 472.

[37] Birch, II, 372.

[38] Ibid., p. 335.

[39] The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., During the Reigns of James I. and Charles I., ed. James Orchard Halliwell (London: Richard Bentley, 1845), I, 219-220.

This pulpit propaganda was basic to the continuation of the Puritan party, but it was not a direct effort to implement the Puritan program. This part of the party system was kept alive by the Puritan laymen in the parliament. In almost every parliament of the reign, bills were brought in against "scandalous ministers," and from time to time attacks were made on offensive high churchmen. These were negative measures, but more positive attempts were also made. Shortly after James came to the throne, a bill was introduced for "providing of a godly and learned Ministry,"[40] and in 1606 Sir Francis Hastings had the audacity to urge a "Bill for the Restoring of deprived Ministers."[41] The commons felt the importance of the issue and petitioned the king in the ministers' behalf, but failed to obtain a satisfactory answer.[42] In 1610 Sir Edwin Sandys drew up a list of ecclesiastical grievances, including the failure to execute the laws against the recusants, the existence of nonresidence and pluralities, the abuses of excommunication, and the silencing of ministers.[43] The king, though conciliatory in spirit, refused to entertain any ideas of mitigating the condition of the deprived ministers. No church, he told the commons, could harbor clergymen who refused to subscribe to its doctrines and discipline.[44]

---

[40] Great Britain, The Journal of the House of Commons, I, 229. (Hereafter cited as C.J.)

[41] Ibid., p. 274.

[42] Cal.S.P., Dom., Jas.I, Vol. VIII (1603-10), p. 314. See the debate, C.J., I, 285.

[43] C.J., I, 420.

[44] Gardiner, II, 84-85.

The same issue came up again in the parliament of 1614 and was the partial cause of one of the parliamentary politicians being committed to the Tower.[45] Perhaps the most interesting indication of the Puritanism of the commons occurred in 1621 when Thomas Shepherd was "banished the house for ridiculing the Puritans."[46] One diarist tells us that when the usual bill for the better observation of the Sabbath was offered, "Mr. Shepherd of Lincoln's Inn took exception." Becoming excited, Shepherd declared that "it savored of the spirit of a puritan, exclaiming against justices of the peace in the country for favouring them, taxing the House, saying they made laws which were gins and snares for papists but not so much as a mouse-trap for a puritan, etc."[47] Though obviously indiscreet, Shepherd was fairly accurate. The house called him to the bar, bade him withdraw, and then voted his expulsion as an unworthy member--the whole incident calling forth Pym's maiden speech.[48] James was piqued at this demonstration, and made a point to show it. "I heare yow gave yeasterdaie a severe Sentence uppon one for speakinge against Puritans," he declared. "I wish yow would be as carefull to represse them as the Papists."[49]

This Puritan opposition was sustained throughout the reign, and doubtless did a good deal to annoy the government. But it never seems to have reached serious proportions. Puritans might be capable of raising a stir over the deprivation of ministers or the Book of Sports, but they never really succeeded in exciting the whole nation as they were to do in the next reign. In part this was due to the attitudes and character of James. Religiously, he was no Laudian but a conservative Anglican, and if he did not know how to yield gracefully as his predecessor had done, he at least knew how to yield. Moreover, through all this Puritan resistance after the first years of James's reign there runs a strain of freedom, individualism, and spontaneity which would seem to preclude the possibility of any real degree of organization. The Puritans in parliament may have banded together, and occasionally we get glimpses of joint clerical action as when some London ministers went to the king to "inveigh against the ecclesiastical government."[50] But these seem to have been only temporary and fluctuating ties and certainly produced nothing memorable. It seems clear that Stuart Puritanism did not yet have the strength necessary to support a vigorous party organization.

---

[45] Cal.S.P., Dom., Jas.I, Vol. IX (1611-18), p. 237.

[46] Ibid., Vol. X (1619-23), p. 225.

[47] Commons Debates 1621, eds. Wallace Notestein, Frances Helen Relf, Hartley Simpson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), II, 82.

[48] Ibid., pp. 82, 96.

[49] Ibid., IV, 75, n.v.

By the end of James's reign, however, forces were coming into play which were changing this situation rapidly. For one thing, the Stuart alliance with the church against the parliament tended to draw the constitutional and religious opposition closer together. Moreover, the progress of the Counter-Reformation in Germany and France made men fear the emergence of a militant Catholicism in England. Once again, as in the days of Elizabeth, the Catholic danger propelled anxious Protestants toward the Puritan camp. This tendency was given a great impetus by the emergency of an aggressive and well organized Anglican party dedicated to stressing the Catholic tradition of the Church of England. Laud and his friends were not crypto-Catholics, but in the excitement of the day men could be excused for seeming to see in them the vanguard of the Catholic menace. Already in 1617 disturbances had occurred at the cathedral of Gloucester when Laud, in his capacity as dean, had ventured to alter the position of the communion table, and in the next reign these incidents rapidly increased.

---

[50] Cal.S.P., Dom., Jas.I, Vol. IX (1611-18), p. 460.

The force which tended to crystallize all these currents may well have been the excitement attendant on the Spanish marriage and the war with Spain. With the example of the Palatinate and of the Huguenots before them, English Protestants were thrown into a panic by the thought of a Catholic toleration and an eventual Catholic dynasty. The excitement reached its highest pitch when Charles and Buckingham journeyed to Spain. Then when the angered English party returned without a Spanish bride and called for war on Spain, English patriotism was again summoned to a feverish point. It was only natural that these stirring events should break the repose and tranquility of James's rule and provide an excellent opportunity for Puritanism, as the patriotic Protestant party, to once more assume an important role. With the rise of a new generation of leaders around the figure of John Preston, Puritanism was ready to accept the challenge. A new party organization was completed which was to last until the end of Stuart parliamentary rule in 1629. As was always the case, this new Puritan party regarded a strong faction in parliament as the only hope of obtaining a reformation. Consequently, both laity and clergy concentrated all their efforts to the task of building up a strong current of sympathy for Puritanism in the houses. To this end, until triumph was attained in 1641, the best energies of the Puritan movement were dedicated. As Peter Heylyn expressed it in his own racy style, "The Grandees of the Puritan faction . . . . after the first heats were over in Queen Elizabeth's time, carried their work for thirty years together, like Moles under the Ground, not casting up any Earth before them, till they had made so strong a party in the House of Commons as was able to hold the King to their own Conditions."[51]

---

[51] Peter Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus (Dublin: John Hyde and Robert Owen, 1719), Part II, Book V, p. 57.

CHAPTER II

THE NEW PURITAN PARTY: THE LAITY AND THE PARLIAMENT

I

Because Puritanism was so closely associated with the merchant, landed, and legal classes, a large exclusively religious opposition among the laity was never formed. Rather, Puritan discontent tended to fuse with the other disaffected elements of the nation to such a degree that it is almost impossible to isolate religious motives from the other factors which determined the actions of those opposed to the policies of the first two Stuarts. Indeed, to attempt to make any such isolation would be to display a grievous ignorance of the psychological complexity of motive which characterizes the chief actors in any great historical movement. And in the case of Puritanism, there can be no doubt that the parliamentary leaders threw themselves into the struggle against the crown for a multiplicity of reasons--social, economic, and constitutional as well as religious.

This close interrelation between Puritanism and the English middle classes has long been recognized. On the one hand, Puritanism, though it never succeeded in monopolizing the religious allegiance of the middle class, recruited its adherents largely from this class. Indeed, the movement had originated among the Henrician merchants and had gradually extended its sway over large portions of the other groups of the same class, primarily through the expedient of making capital out of its aggressive and unadulterated Protestantism in contrast with the "superstitious" and "popish" Anglican via media. This association of

Puritanism and the middle classes had steadily progressed until by the time of the Long Parliament Baxter could observe that the parliamentary party was made up of "the middle sort of Men," and then follow up the assertion with the suggestive allusion, "If you ask the Reasons of this Difference, ask also, why in France it is not commonly the Nobility nor the Beggars, but the Merchants and middle sort of Men, that were Protestants."[1] All the while, this tradition of association was becoming fixed, and to a significant segment of the middle classes, Puritanism was assuming the character of a precious heritage to be adhered to as a matter of course. On the other hand, Puritanism itself was strongly affected by middle class influences to such an extent that in its later period of decline, it was rather completely captured by bourgeois ideals.[2] Though this was not yet the case in the first half of the century, the constitutional and economic viewpoints of Puritanism's allies had become native to the movement to a degree sufficient to make religion a powerful aid to the parliamentarians in the struggles which led up to the Civil War. Already by the 1630's, the Puritan ministry had produced a Henry Burton who viewed the cause of religion and of country as a unity,[3] while by the time of the Long Parliament Stephen Marshall was naively comparing the church to a joint-stock company in his sermons.[4] Clearly, this relationship between Puritanism and the other elements of the opposition partook more of the nature of interpenetration than of mere coalition. Perhaps nowhere was this truth more typically expressed than in a letter of John Winthrop urging the election of Sir Robert Naunton on the grounds that "he is knowne to be sounde for Religion, firme to the Com[mon] W[ealth] . . . . and the meetest man to further the affaires of our Countrye, for our Clothiers businesse etc."[5]

---

[1] Reliquiae Baxterianae, Part I, p. 30.

[2] For this tendency of Puritanism in its decadence, see Tawney, pp. 195-273.

[3] [Henry Burton], A Narration of the Life of Mr. Henry Burton (London, 1643), p. 9.

[4] Stephen Marshall, Meroz Cursed or a Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons at Their Late Solemn Fast, Febr. 23. 1641 (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1641), p. 19.

Side by side with this genuine fusion of religious and nonreligious grievances, however, there existed a more artificial union brought into being by the necessity of the opposition. In desperate combat with the crown, the parliament could not afford to ignore so powerful a force as Puritanism. On the contrary, it was inclined to annex any grievances which would give weight to its cause in the struggle. The confusion which this artificial "Puritanism" produced was enhanced by the fact that the vicissitudes of politics led the houses to vary religious and other grievances in such a way as to create issues at those points where the strongest cases could be made.

Despite this high degree of identification--both genuine and artificial--of Puritanism with the other national interests, it should not be concluded that religion was subordinated to the other grievances of parliament. It is important that this be emphasized, because the close association of Puritanism with the other parliamentary complaints and the evident political advantage of championing Puritanism can be made to support the view that the Puritan complexion of parliament was largely an illusion maintained by the shrewd hypocrisy of the Erastian or indifferent membership.[6] Though such an interpretation has much truth in it, it is certainly an overstatement. It is true that "profane" motivations were strongly felt and that the Puritan Revolution was only partially Puritan, but to deny the existence of religious interests in a seventeenth-century parliament is of the same order as to deny the existence of economic interests in a nineteenth-century senate. Even a superficial familiarity with the sources of Stuart history is sufficient to lead one to suspect that so dynamic a movement as Puritanism would extend its influence into the parliament; and especially is this true when one considers that through the course of time, the parliament became the only adequate platform for the expression of Puritan discontent.

---

[5] Winthrop Papers (Boston: The Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929-1947), I, 325-326.

[6] J. W. Allen, English Political Thought, 1603-1660 (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1938) seems to lean toward this view.

It would, of course, be patently false to assert that the parliament was unqualifiedly Puritan, but it is certainly true that it was overwhelmingly Protestant in a Puritan direction. In all likelihood, most of the members belonged to a vast, rather nebulous, Protestant center which was almost pathologically obsessed with the fear of Roman Catholicism and which looked in dismay at the inclination toward toleration which was characteristic of the whole Stuart dynasty. In addition, these members had deep misgivings about Charles's endorsement of the high church policy, and in reaction came to regard Puritanism as a defense of the national church against the innovations of un-English crypto-Romanists. Without becoming enthusiastic about a radical alteration in the church, they were willing to support a certain amount of ecclesiastical reform in the direction of Puritanism, chiefly as an effective countercheck to the insidious influence of the Anglo-Catholics.

This sort of attitude, if it was not devotedly Puritan in itself, was at least strongly susceptible to Puritan suggestions.

As a matter of fact, the evidence indicates that Puritanism was potent enough to make its influence felt in a very real sense throughout the whole assembly. This fact is well attested by the feeling of contemporaries that Puritanism had leavened the whole parliamentary lump. In newsletters and diaries, Puritanism and the various other forces contending with the crown were inseparably linked, and observers, such as the Venetian ambassador, habitually denominated the members of the parliamentary opposition "Puritans."[7] Usage of the term in this manner was doubtless meant to be derogatory and hence is somewhat unreliable, but it nonetheless indicates a certain sympathy which a large part of the parliament entertained toward the Puritan cause. That a certain degree of substance lay behind this popular reputation was displayed by the parliament itself in its repeated resolutions, petitions, and remonstrances on religion. Even in 1625, a year of notable good feeling, the commons refused to grant supplies to the king partly on the grounds that their religious grievances had not yet been satisfied,[8] while in the celebrated Eliot Resolutions of 1629 religious discontent took its place side by side with economic and constitutional grievances.[9] Members, moreover, were tenacious of what they regarded as the traditional Protestant theology of the Church of England and, as time passed, became

---

[7] Cal.S.P., Venet., Vols. XIX-XXI, passim. It is interesting to note that when James determined to dissolve the parliament of 1614, his decision was called a "break with the Puritans" (David Harris Willson, The Privy Councillors in the House of Commons 1604-1629 [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1940], p. 141).

[8] Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, ed. Samuel Rawson Gardiner ("Camden Society Publications," New Series, VI [Westminster, 1873]), p. 149.

[9] Commons Debates for 1629 Critically Edited and an Introduction Dealing with Parliamentary Sources for the Early Stuarts, eds. Wallace Notestein and Frances Helen Relf (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1921), p. 267.

As a matter of fact, the evidence indicates that Puritanism was potent enough to make its influence felt in a very real sense throughout the whole assembly. This fact is well attested by the feeling of contemporaries that Puritanism had leavened the whole parliamentary lump. In newsletters and diaries, Puritanism and the various other forces contending with the crown were inseparably linked, and observers, such as the Venetian ambassador, habitually denominated the members of the parliamentary opposition "Puritans."[7] Usage of the term in this manner was doubtless meant to be derogatory and hence is somewhat unreliable, but it nonetheless indicates a certain sympathy which a large part of the parliament entertained toward the Puritan cause. That a certain degree of substance lay behind this popular reputation was displayed by the parliament itself in its repeated resolutions, petitions, and remonstrances on religion. Even in 1625, a year of notable good feeling, the commons refused to grant supplies to the king partly on the grounds that their religious grievances had not yet been satisfied,[8] while in the celebrated Eliot Resolutions of 1629 religious discontent took its place side by side with economic and constitutional grievances.[9] Members, moreover, were tenacious of what they regarded as the traditional Protestant theology of the Church of England and, as time passed, became increasingly severe on the Anglo-Catholicizing divines. At times, this feeling became so strong that one member so forgot his civil character as to rise to discuss the "fallibility of grace accordinge to the distinction of the schooles," though, to be sure, the commons usually preferred to remain clear of theological debate.[10]

---

[7] Cal.S.P., Venet., Vols. XIX-XXI, passim. It is interesting to note that when James determined to dissolve the parliament of 1614, his decision was called a "break with the Puritans" (David Harris Willson, The Privy Councillors in the House of Commons 1604-1629 [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1940], p. 141).

[8] Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, ed. Samuel Rawson Gardiner ("Camden Society Publications," New Series, VI [Westminster, 1873]), p. 149.

[9] Commons Debates for 1629 Critically Edited and an Introduction Dealing with Parliamentary Sources for the Early Stuarts, eds. Wallace Notestein and Frances Helen Relf (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1921), p. 267.

It is true, of course, that much of the support which Puritanism derived from parliament was dictated by the necessity of combatting the pretensions of the king and hierarchy at home and the triumphs of Roman Catholicism on the Continent. Nevertheless, there seems to have been a recognition among contemporaries that the members were inclined to attach genuine importance to religion itself. Apparently, there was a tendency, not altogether naive, to regard the issue of religion as central in the contention between the king and the parliament. "Some spare not to say . . . . ," noted one observer in describing this attitude near the end of the first parliament of Charles I,

> that all goes backward since this connivance in religion came in, both in our wealth, honour, valour, and reputation, and that it is visibly seen God blesses nothing that we take in hand. Whereas, in Queen Elizabeth's time, who stood firm in God's cause, all things did flourish.[11]

This feeling was evidently quite prevalent among the members, and Sir John Eliot, himself a leader in the house, regarded it as something of a basic principle of parliamentary procedure. "Wher ever that mention," he declared, "does breake of the fears of dangers in religion, & the increase of poperie, their affections are much stir'd, & what ever is obnoxious in the State, it then is reckoned as an incident to that."[12] Thus, in their concern for religion, the parliament men gave Puritanism something of a guarantee that the movement would be protected against royal and hierarchical attack.

---

[10] Debates in 1625, p. 71. Cf. Sir John Eliot's comment on those who brought theology into parliamentary discussions (Sir John Eliot, An Apology for Socrates and Negotium Posterorum, ed. Alexander B. Grossart [London: Chiswick Press, 1881], II, 15).

[11] [Thomas Birch] (ed.), The Court and Times of Charles the First (London: Henry Colburn, 1848), I, 36.

But in spite of the fact that Puritanism found its principal support in the vast numerical superiority of the sympathetic, middle-class, Protestant membership, such support could not hope to satisfy the impatient aspirations of the Puritan movement. For one thing, the parliament as a whole, while willing to protect Puritanism from attack, did not possess the dynamic necessary to take the initiative and launch a Puritan offensive. Moreover, the entire body was much too unwieldy and much too public to be entrusted with the secrets of Puritan strategy. Luckily, Puritanism did not have to rely on the vague, general sympathy of the parliament as a whole, for it was directly represented in that assembly by a small but devoted group of Puritan laymen. The constitution of such a Puritan group is, to be sure, somewhat difficult to establish, primarily because the differences between the Puritans and their fellow-members were largely in the degree of religious intensity. Unlike their more moderate brethren, however, the Puritan members brought to their demands for reformation a spirited zeal and activeness. These Puritan members were not only highly organized within the house, but also seem to have remained in close touch with clerical and lay Puritan leadership in London and in the shires. In addition, Puritan parliament men were probably able in some measure to compensate for their small numbers by occupying strategic positions in the organization of the opposition in parliament. Armed with these advantages, the Puritan group could be indeed formidable, and it is altogether likely that it was the power of this group which Buckingham utilized during the period of his alliance with the Puritans, and that it was this same group which joined the opposition to the government after the alliance had broken down.[13]

---

[12] Eliot, I, 69-70.

II

Though the history of the alliance with Buckingham leaves no room for doubt that a Puritan party actually existed, it is a task of great difficulty to identify its composition. All the members of parliament would have counted themselves as Reformed Protestants, and except for the possible existence of a small high church faction,[14] the general Protestantism of the whole merged quite imperceptibly into the more zealous Puritanism of the few. Despite the formidable difficulties involved, it is nevertheless possible to classify a number of the members as definitely Puritan. In general, this must be determined by individual biographical investigation, but in the case of many members a reliable short-cut has been provided by the fact that parliament men often manifested their Puritanism by participating in peculiarly Puritan enterprises.[15] During the early part of Charles's reign, two such enterprises were employed to further the interests of the movement. The first was the feoffees of impropriations organization, by which an effort was made to capture the English church from within by building up a large army of Puritan lecturers who would gradually take over the functions of the idle Anglican rectors. The second was the despairing abandonment of the English scene in the attempt to establish a Puritan paradise in the New World--a project which was undertaken by several Puritan companies and which increasingly absorbed the energies of the movement as the long night of the personal rule advanced.

---

[13] See below, chap. iv.

[14] One would expect that there would be at least a few members of high church sympathies in the commons. In 1625 Richard Montague seems to have been informed of the commons' charges against him by someone apparently on the committee (The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D. Lord Bishop of Durham, [ed. George Ornsby] ["Surtees Society Publications," LII (London, 1869)], p. 88).

[15] Although participation in these enterprises does not constitute an infallible index to membership in the Puritan party, it is an excellent guide when confirmed by other evidence. J. H. Hexter has used this method for the Long Parliament in his The Reign of King Pym (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941), pp. 77-82.

In general, the amount of light thrown on the Puritan parliamentary party by the history of the feoffees of impropriation is disappointing.[16] Indeed, the whole enterprise may be dismissed after noting that Christopher Sherland of Gray's Inn was one of the leaders. This lawyer was the only parliament man on the central board of twelve feoffees, though, to be sure, he was one of the most prominent lay leaders of the Puritan movement and a man whom we are to meet again in connection with the Puritan-Buckingham alliance.[17] It is true that a representative of the City in the commons, Sir Heneage Finch, probably acted as attorney for the board, but there is little evidence that he had any intimate connection with the Puritan party.[18]

---

[16] For literature on the feoffees, see Ethyn W. Kirby, "The Lay Feoffees: a Study in Militant Puritanism," Journal of Modern History, XIV (1942), 1-25; Henry A. Parker, "The Feoffees of Impropriation," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts: Transactions, XI (1906-1907), 263-277. See also below, chap. v.

[17] Kirby, JMH, XIV (1942), 6. See his funeral sermon, preached by Sibbes (The Complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D. D., Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge; Preacher of Gray's Inn, London, ed. Alexander Balloch Grossart [Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1862-1864], I, 337-350).

[18] Kirby, JMH, XIV (1942), 7, n. 15; James McMullen Rigg, "Sir Heneage Finch," DNB, Vol. VI.

When we turn to the colonizing ventures,[19] the information which we gain here is much more gratifying. Probably the earliest Puritan enterprise in this direction was the Dorchester Company. Organized as early as 1623, this company had the double purpose of supplying "the fishermen and other of our nation" in New England with religious instruction and of providing an American asylum for persecuted Puritans.[20] The whole enterprise was largely a West country Puritan venture, for the organizing force was John White, the leading Puritan minister of Dorchester, and most of the members were recruited from Dorsetshire and Devonshire.[21] Out of about 120 adventurers in all were nine men who held seats in at least some of the first three parliaments of Charles I,[22] and out of these were three who can be said to possess any significance. In the case of Sir Richard Strode, the significance was largely the accident of birth for he was evidently of the same family as William Strode, the bitter extremist and furious opponent of the king.[23] Another Dorchester adventurer, Richard Bushrod, was an important West country merchant and later one of the members of the Massachusetts Bay Company.[24] Without a doubt, the most famous of all the Dorchester Company members was Sir Walter Erle, a frequent speaker in the house and a man apparently high in the councils of the popular party.[25]

---

[19] The best general treatment of Puritan colonizing activities is contained in Charles McLean Andrews, The Colonial Period of American History (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934), Vol. I. More specialized histories of the ventures are Frances Rose-Troup, John White (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1930); Frances Rose-Troup, The Massachusetts Bay Company and its Predecessors (New York: The Grafton Press, 1930); Arthur Percival Newton, The Colonising Activities of the English Puritans (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1914).

[20] Rose-Troup, The Massachusetts Bay Company, p. 13.

[21] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 63.

[22] A complete list of the Dorchester adventurers is contained in Rose-Troup, John White, pp. 447-460. To discover the commons members this list has been checked with the returns in Great Britain, House of Commons, Members of Parliament (1878). The nine parliament men in the company were Sir Richard Strode, Richard Bushrod, Sir Walter Erle, Sir Francis Ashley, John Browne, Giles Green, Francis Crossing, John Poole, and Matthew Pitt.

[23] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 453. Both men were of Newnham, Devonshire. On William Strode, see Charles Harding Firth, "William Strode," DNB, Vol. XIX.

Far more important than the Dorchester Company, however, was its heir once removed, the Massachusetts Bay Company. The Dorchester venture had never been very successful, and in the revisions which took place, first in its transition into the New England Company and then into the Massachusetts Bay Company, new strength was acquired from the strongly Puritan areas of East Anglia and the adjacent shires.[26] In its final form, the Massachusetts Bay Company revealed but few similarities with its Dorchester predecessor, and its altered spirit was seen in the greater radicalism of its Eastern shareholders, many of whom had been members in the early parliaments of Charles, now terminated by the period of personal rule. One of the late members of the commons who joined the company was Richard Bushrod, one of the few remaining Dorchester men, but in addition to this member, seven other parliament men became active in the Massachusetts organization.[27] Unlike the obscurity of the members of the Dorchester Company, a higher proportion of these Massachusetts stockholders achieved a modicum of importance, though here again none of them can be said to have been parliamentary leaders. Henry Darley seems to have moved in the inner circles of the Puritan party and later became one of the more prominent representatives in the Long Parliament.[28] Matthew Cradock and Richard Bellingham were both of great significance for early American history, the former being the first governor of the company[29] and the latter filling the same office in Massachusetts during the critical Restoration period.[30] Sir William Brereton was wholeheartedly in the Puritan camp, and in the crisis of 1642, he put himself at the head of a band of troops and attempted to retain Cheshire for the parliament.[31] Lastly, Sir Nathaniel Barnardiston was a man of celebrated piety, to such an extent that he acquired the reputation of being something of an arch-Puritan--a judgment which he confirmed by refusing to submit to the forced loan and choosing imprisonment together with his equally Puritanical cousin, Richard Knightley, and the famous John Hampden.[32]

---

[24] Rose-Troup, John White, pp. 58-61, 451.

[25] *Ibid*., p. 454.

[26] Perry Miller, Orthodoxy in Massachusetts 1630-1650 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933), pp. 102-104.

[27] A complete list of the members of the Massachusetts Bay Company is to be found in Rose-Troup, The Massachusetts Bay Company, pp. 131-161. In addition to the five mentioned below, Joseph Bradshawe and Henry Waller seem to have been members of parliament, though not so stated by Rose-Troup.

On the whole, the Massachusetts Bay Company, like the Dorchester Company, was made up of average members of the gentry and merchant classes rather than of the Puritan great. But while the parliament men who later joined the Massachusetts Company could not be counted among the leaders of the commons, neither could they be classed among the inarticulate nonentities. Most of them were listened to with respect in the house, and their presence undoubtedly lent support to the policies of the popular leaders. Moreover, they seem to have been called upon to share in the administration of parliamentary business, for we find their names on the lists of important committees in the Journal. In general, it may be said that they were among that group of secondary commons members who, without being leaders themselves, filled the very necessary function of being influential and capable followers. At the same time, however, there is some indication that Puritan leaders of the first rank were interested in the success of the Massachusetts enterprise. Sir John Eliot received a copy of the "Arguments," a paper detailing the advantages of removing to the New World,[33] while in 1630 an English correspondent wrote a colonist that the company was much indebted to Lord Say and the Earl of Warwick for their "cordial advice & true affections.[34] The same letter also praised Sir Nathaniel Rich for his "wise handling," and this information together with the knowledge that the company probably used powerful influence at court to secure its charter suggests that at least some of the Puritan leaders in the house of lords were working in close cooperation with the Massachusetts group.[35]

---

[28] _Ibid._, p. 141; Newton, pp. 125-126.

[29] Sidney Lee, "Matthew Cradock," _DNB_, Vol. IV.

[30] Thomas Finlayson Henderson, "Richard Bellingham," _ibid._, Vol. II; Henry P. Stearns, "Richard Bellingham," _Dictionary of American Biography_, ed. Allen Johnson, Vol. II (1929).

[31] Thomas Finlayson Henderson, "Sir William Brereton," _DNB_, Vol. II.

[32] Sidney Lee, "Sir Nathaniel Barnardiston," _ibid._, Vol. I.

The major leaders of the parliament, however, not only displayed their Puritanism by giving aid to the Massachusetts adventurers but also by organizing a colonizing venture of their own. This was the famous Providence Company--a company which had on its membership rolls the names of many of the most eminent

---

[33] Winthrop Papers, II, 145.

[34] The Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections, Fourth Series, Vol. VI (Boston: The Massachusetts Historical Society, 1863), p. 3.

[35] See below, chap. v.

Puritans of the day. The company was established shortly after the royal dissolution in 1629 had silenced the Puritan protest in parliament and released Puritan energies for other achievements. From the very first, the company was closely identified with the Puritans, and much of the management was under the direction of the great party leader in the house of lords, Robert Rich, earl of Warwick. Under his supervision, the company's colony on the Isle of Providence in the Caribbean promised to become half a Puritan commonwealth and half an outpost against the hated Spanish.[36] Although the colony had only very meager success, it was not for want of able leadership at home. Out of twenty shareholders as the company was finally constituted in 1631, eight were champions of the popular party in the house of commons, and four more were among the most important Puritan lords in the upper house.[37]

It is somewhat paradoxical that the governor of the company, Henry Rich, earl of Holland, had almost nothing to do with it. Despite his Puritan family and education, Holland was only loosely attached to the Puritan cause, and during the Civil War he alternated between the royalist and parliamentary factions until his vacillation was brought to a halt on the scaffold. His high office probably resulted from the fact that he combined in his person a Puritan background with considerable influence at court, and thus could be of great use to the company.[38]

About Holland's brother, Warwick, something has already been said. He was looked up to as one of the principal champions of Puritanism both at home and abroad, and was a constant opponent of the high church policy and of the extra-parliamentary means by which the king attempted to raise money. It is also interesting to note that he was the patron of the notorious republican divine, Hugh Peter, a man whose career joined both shores of the Atlantic.[39] It was in the field of colonial ventures, however, that Warwick reached his true height. The settlements of Bermuda, Virginia, Massachusetts, Saybrook, and Providence all owed something to the earl and several of them enjoyed his management. By the time of the organization of the Providence Company, Warwick was not only one of the most eminent Puritans in the realm but an experienced hand at colonizing activity as well.[40]

---

[36] Newton, pp. 40-79.

[37] _Ibid_., p. 59.

[38] _Ibid_., p. 61.

The Lords Say and Brooke completed the quartet of Puritan peers in the company. Both lords had leanings toward Independency and were very definitely of Puritan stamp. Their antipathy to the court party was constant, and this in spite of the facts that Say had been given a viscountcy by Buckingham and that Brooke's adopted father had been a royal favorite. Like Warwick, Brooke patronized the Puritan clergy, maintaining the enigmatic Puritan divine, Peter Sterry, as his chaplain. After the outbreak of the Civil War both men were ardent in the parliamentary cause--a cause in which Brooke met his death at Lichfield in 1643.[41]

When we turn to the eight commons members in the Providence Company, the catalogue is equally impressive. Without a doubt, the most important of the Providence stockholders was

---

[39] Raymond Phineas Stearns, "Letters and Documents by or relating to Hugh Peter," Essex Institute Historical Collections, LXXI (1935), 310-311.

[40] Charles Harding Firth, "Robert Rich," DNB, Vol. XVI.

[41] Charles Harding Firth, "William Fiennes," ibid., Vol. VI; James McMullen Rigg, "Robert Greville," ibid., Vol. VIII.

John Pym, the great leader of the commons during the early, crucial years of the Long Parliament. Pym was brought up in the strongly Puritan family of his step-father, Sir Anthony Rous, and by the time he entered parliament in 1620 his religious orientation was irrevocably fixed. Beginning with the accession of Charles I in 1625, Pym's leadership slowly began to emerge, and by the parliament of 1628-1629 he was the foremost member of the house. It was altogether natural that when the king dissolved parliament in 1629, Pym should devote his time until the beginning of the Short Parliament to the furtherance of Puritan interests abroad.[42]

Even more Puritan in background was Richard Knightley. Knightley, though but little known, was certainly one of the leading members of the Puritan circle in the house of commons. His family had been staunchly Puritan since the days of Elizabeth, when one of the members had been deeply implicated in the Martin Marprelate libels.[43] Richard was exceedingly bitter in his opposition to the crown, and in 1626 the effectiveness of his attacks was tacitly acknowledged by the king in appointing him sheriff of Northamptonshire and thus excluding him from the commons.[44] An intimate neighbor of Knightley's was another member of the Providence Company, Christopher Sherland, the confidant of the preacher-politician, John Preston, and a man about whom something has already been said.

Sir Benjamin Rudyerd, though definitely in the Puritan camp, was something of a moderate in his opposition to the government. Throughout his career, he remains somewhat a puzzle, for at times he could combine a zeal for church reform with his position as spokesman for the government. Despite a tendency to compromise, Rudyerd was always regarded as a Puritan, and possibly his known moderation lent weight to his words among the generality of the house.[45]

---

[42] Samuel Rawson Gardiner, "John Pym," ibid., Vol. XVI. There are several works on Pym. See especially J. H. Hexter, The Reign of King Pym (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941); S. Reed Brett, John Pym (London: John Murray, 1940); C. E. Wade, John Pym (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1912).

[43] Knappen, p. 327.

[44] Sidney Lee, "Richard Knightley," DNB, Vol. XI.

Of the remaining four parliament men in the Providence Company, Sir Nathaniel Rich seems to have been the most active. A member of the house of Warwick, through an extra-marital connection of the second Lord Rich, Sir Nathaniel always remained on very intimate terms with the earl and frequently acted as his business agent. In 1610 he had been admitted to Gray's Inn and apparently became a close friend of the Inn's preacher, the famous Puritan minister, Richard Sibbes.[46] In parliament he became increasingly prominent and was frequently named to the most important committees.[47]

The names Sir Thomas Barrington, Sir Gilbert Gerrard, and Sir Edmond Moundeford complete the list of parliament men in the Providence Company. Of these, Barrington is worthy of notice for the intensity of the Puritanism of his family. In addition to being related to many of the prominent Puritan leaders, the Barrington family was well represented in Lady Joan, who acted as something of a secretary of the Puritan movement, and in Sir

---

[45] Charles Harding Firth, "Sir Benjamin Rudyerd," ibid., Vol. XVII.

[46] See Sibbes's letter of introduction for Rich to Ussher (The Whole Works of the Most Rev. James Ussher, D. D., Lord Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland, ed. Charles Richard Elrington [Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co., 1864], XVI, 440-441).

[47] Charles Alexander Harris, "Sir Nathaniel Rich," DNB, Vol. XVI.

Francis, who preferred imprisonment to submission to the forced loan.[48]

Though this concludes the catalogue of the Providence Company, it is necessary briefly to note the activities of the Saybrook venture--an enterprise that was intimately connected with the Providence men. In 1632 Warwick granted lands in what is now part of Connecticut to a small group of Puritans, most of whom had been members of the Providence Company. The parliament men among the members were Lords Say and Brooke, Sir Nathaniel Rich, Richard Knightley, and John Pym, and it seems apparent that by 1635 Henry Darley had become connected with the company.[49] All of these men we have met before, and this very fact displays to a certain extent the interlocking character of the governing boards of Puritan enterprises.

It is undeniable that an investigation of the membership rolls of the Dorchester, Massachusetts Bay, Providence, and Saybrook Companies does enable us to begin to discern the nucleus of a Puritan party in parliament. To be sure, the group was not entirely homogeneous, and the parliament men of each company seem to form smaller groupings within the whole. Nevertheless, the interpenetration of the memberships of the companies is sufficient to leave little room for doubt that the Puritanism of all overcame any sectionalism which may have existed. Thus, Sir Richard Bushrod was a member of the Dorchester and Massachusetts Bay Companies, Henry Darley was a member of the Massachusetts and Saybrook Companies, and five of the Saybrook men were Providence adventurers.

---

[48] Newton, pp. 64-65.

[49] Newton, pp. 83-84; Benjamin Trumbull, A Complete History of Connecticut Civil and Ecclesiastical from the Emigration of its First Planters, from England, in the Year 1630 to the Year 1764 (New London: H. D. Utley, 1898), I, 423-426.

Moreover, it is plain that several of the Providence and Saybrook members gave significant aid to the struggling Massachusetts Company in its early days. The degree of informal unity thus achieved made the Puritan group powerful far beyond its size. Equally important with this unity, however, was the fact that the Puritan movement possessed adherents in the select leadership which tended to dominate the legislature as well as in the large supporting body. Certainly such men as Rudyerd, Knightley, Rich, Sherland, and, above all, Pym were among the first rank of opposition leaders in the commons, while Warwick, Say, and Brooke made their influence felt in both houses.

But it is important to remember that while the investigation of Puritan enterprises does enable us to glimpse a nucleus of a Puritan party in the parliament, it is, after all, only a nucleus. The historian who works in parliamentary history is constantly aware that the Puritan membership in the parliament far exceeded the number of those who participated in the Puritan enterprises. It is natural that only a partial view should be furnished by this index, and we know from other evidence that many parliament men not comprehended in the colonizing ventures were definitely Puritan. Such men as Francis Rous,[50] Sir Robert Harley,[51] Henry Sherfield,[52] and Sir John Eliot[53] were all prominent Puritan advocates in the commons, and this catalogue is by no means exhaustive.

---

[50] James McMullen Rigg, "Francis Rous," DNB, Vol. XVII.

[51] Warwick William Wroth, "Sir Robert Harley," ibid., Vol. VIII.

[52] Edward Irving Carlyle, "Henry Sherfield," ibid., Vol. XVIII.

[53] Samuel Rawson Gardiner, "Sir John Eliot," ibid., Vol. VI.

III

We have suspected from the beginning, however, that in all likelihood the strength of Puritanism in parliament did not result from its numerical strength so much as from its highly developed organization. To a considerable degree, the Puritan party in the house of commons was an integral section of the general opposition, and we know that as early as 1610 the various elements contending with the crown had begun to organize themselves into an effective party. In an attack on the house written at this time, Lord Ellesmere especially denounced the opposition for keeping "secrette and privye Conventicles and Conferences, wherein they devised and sett down speciall plottes, for the Carryinge of Business in the house, according to theyr owne humour and dryfte."[54] By the time of Charles, this organization had become highly developed, and in 1628 we find the leaders of the popular party in the commons gathering at the house of Sir Robert Cotton to plan the strategy for the coming parliament.[55] That the Puritan group was intertwined with this general parliamentary opposition is displayed in the fact that out of the eight leaders who met at Sir Robert's--Wentworth, Phelips, Holles, Eliot, Selden, Kirton, Pym, and Coke--at least three, Pym, Eliot, and Holles, were deeply involved in the Puritan movement.

But in addition to its interpenetration with the other elements of the opposition, the Puritan group seems to have developed a party organization of its own. Here we are on rather unsure ground, but there is some evidence that the Puritan group made an effort to maintain action in concert. Indeed, co-operation of this sort among the Puritan members was much more easily achieved than among other parliamentary groups, for the Puritan parliament men were already tied together by blood, friendship, locality, and business association as well as by religious interests. That some degree of action in concert was actually attained seems obvious from the facts that the group apparently accepted _en bloc_ the overtures of Buckingham in 1623, and that John Preston, the great Puritan minister, prevented some members of the party from attacking the duke in 1625 but released them all in 1626.[56] Something very like party spirit and party discipline also developed in sufficient strength to cause the rejection of a course of action which might produce a party split. Thus, in a conference in 1626 Preston yielded to what was apparently the majority decision of his own party even though such a judgment was in direct conflict with his own inclination, and it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that the Puritan members in parliament frequently did the same.[57] With the development of party loyalty, the Puritan group took on many of the characteristics of modern parliamentary partisan organizations.

---

[54] Willson, p. 121, quoting Huntington Library, Ellesmere MSS 2599.

[55] Willson, pp. 203-204.

It was not only within the parliament, however, that effective co-operation was maintained, but efforts were made to connect the Puritan movement throughout the nation with the activity of its parliamentary representatives. To a certain extent, contact was probably directed toward greater effectiveness in agitation, but in a more fundamental sense it was essential to the operation of the Puritan party. For one thing, the Puritan member relied heavily on his constituents for accurate news of the events which were taking place in the shires. But more important than this was the fact that Puritan members were in large measure accredited by the broad Puritan base throughout the nation, and it was with this base that it was imperative that the parliament men keep in frequent communication. The parliamentary members never succeeded in monopolizing the leadership of the movement, though, to be sure, as time passed they tended to gain prestige, primarily because of their vanguard position in the struggle against the Stuart dynasty. Nevertheless, throughout the history of the movement it was demonstrated again and again that little could be done without the sanction of the clerical and lay leadership outside parliament.

---

[56] Thomas Ball, _The Life of Doctor Preston_, in Samuel Clarke, _A Generall Martyrologie, Containing a Collection of All the Greatest Persecutions Which Have Befallen the Church of Christ from the Creation to Our Present Times_ (London: Thomas Underhill and John Rothwell, 1651), pp. 505, 514.

[57] _Ibid._, p. 505

This was especially true with regard to the Puritan ministry. In the beginning, the Puritan movement had displayed a pronounced clerical emphasis, and it was only after years of frustration that this clerical complexion was diluted by the rise of the lay element. Though forced by events to share the direction of the movement, the Puritan divines always managed to retain considerable power. Thus, in the period 1625-1629 we find serious efforts being made to maintain and even to strengthen the ties between the ministers and the parliament men--a subject which will be examined at some length below.[58] Perhaps the best example of the importance of the Puritan preacher in parliamentary politics is the fact that Preston was reputed to be the dictator of the Puritan group, and although this is somewhat extreme, it is undeniable that he wielded a tremendous influence.[59]

Just as the Puritan members sought to work in co-operation with the clergy, so also they seem to have continually consulted with their lay Puritan constituents. To a certain extent, opportunity for such consultation was provided by the Puritan enterprises which we have already investigated. In all of the Puritan colonizing ventures, there existed a vast number of ardent and influential Puritans who as fellow-stockholders must have been led into rather close contact with the parliament men in the company. One of the most likely *foci* of contact was the central board of the lay feoffees of impropriations where the twelve members--four citizens, four clergy, and four lawyers--formed a sort of cross-section of Puritan leadership.

---

[58] See below, chap. iii.

[59] Ball, in Clarke, p. 485.

At least of equal importance with these rather artificial contacts was the direct consultation of the Puritan parliament men with their friends in the counties--friends which in the aggregate constituted a vast Puritan base throughout the nation. Perhaps one of the most valuable insights into the manner by which this contact was maintained is afforded by the *Winthrop Papers*. Here in the correspondence of the future governor of Massachusetts are frequent references to the news of the parliament and other unquestionable evidence of the keen interest of the Puritan gentry in the fortunes of the religious cause in that assembly. Moreover, on occasion, the Puritan constituents went so far as actually to instruct their representatives and even to take an important part in parliamentary policy. Thus, sometime in the winter of 1623-1624, it seems that Winthrop and Robert Ryece, a Suffolk gentleman said to have been educated in Geneva, drew up a lengthy paper which was evidently intended as a basis for action in the house of commons. Bearing the title of "Common Greuances Groaninge for Reformation," this document contained a list of over twenty abuses, economic and constitutional as well as religious--indeed a list which comprehended almost the totality of the causes of discontent with the Stuart regime.[60] In a similar but more specific action in 1627, Winthrop prepared a bill for preventing drunkenness and perhaps planned to introduce it through his good friends in the house, Sir William Spring and Sir Nathaniel Barnardiston.[61] From considerations such as these, it becomes quite plain that Puritan members in parliament were closely linked with the rank and file of the Puritan movement outside.

Yet a third point at which Puritan organization was manifested was in the election of Puritan members to the commons. Puritans were, of course, deeply concerned to secure seats in the lower house, but as a rule they seem to have been either disinclined or perhaps unable to elect commons members on the religious issue alone. As a result, one may say that in general the Puritan parliament men were sent to the legislature by the same union of interests which was evident everywhere in the opposition to the king. This fact adds considerable difficulty to the understanding of Puritan electioneering practice, for the political machinery of the opposition forces in the shires tended to fuse its several constituent elements in such a way that it is virtually impossible to separate the Puritan aspects.

That Puritanism should be represented in this electioneering activity is a natural expectation. We are not obliged to assume the fact, however, for we possess the invaluable testimony of the _Winthrop Papers_, the reliability of which inheres in the indubitable Puritanism of its source. From these documents, we have a rather complete account of the Puritan part in the choosing of the Suffolk representatives for the parliament of 1626. Writing on January 14, Winthrop notified his wife that on a visit to Assington, Suffolk, Brampton Gurdon, Winthrop's neighbor, had suggested that they support the strongly Protestant Sir Robert Naunton, the master of the wards. Winthrop and his brother-in-law, Emanuel Downing, fell in with Gurdon's opinion, and immediately acquainted "Sir Robt. Crane Mrs. Bacon and some others" with their choice.[62] In his letter to Crane written on the same day, Winthrop strongly urged the acceptance of Naunton, declaring that he expected "no exception against him, except for that he is a privie Counseller, which may easyly be removed by consideration of what he hathe formerly suffered for the Commonwealthe." Winthrop further desired Crane to "propounde it to the other gent [-lemen] at Sessions," and in conclusion suggested either Crane himself or Sir Nathaniel Barnardiston as Naunton's running mate.[63] In his reply a few days later, Crane, after some hesitancy, promised his full support,[64] and in the following parliament Naunton and Crane were knights of the shire for Suffolk.

---

[60] _Winthrop Papers_, I, 295-310.

[61] _Ibid_., pp. 371-374.

The significant aspect to these transactions is that all the men involved were staunch Puritans, and while this is somewhat to be expected in so Puritan a section as East Anglia, it is nonetheless a clear demonstration of the existence of Puritan manoeuvering to obtain a sympathetic house of commons. And this fact becomes even clearer when we realize that election manoeuvering of this type was not free of clerical influence. The Puritan pulpit had an excellent opportunity to further the cause of Puritan candidates, and we know that Samuel Ward in 1621[65] and Stephen

---

[62] Ibid., pp. 325-326.

[63] Ibid., pp. 324-325. [64] Ibid., p. 326.

[65] Birch, Court and Times of James I, II, 232.

Marshall in 1640[66] received special notoriety for their electioneering preaching.

In some cases the Puritans were not obliged to go through a struggle to obtain the election of their candidates. That this was so was due to the fact that a certain number of seats in the house were assured by the control which powerful Puritans--sometimes peers--exercised over docile or "owned" burroughs. We know, for instance, that the great "popular" peer, Pembroke, was able to maintain about a dozen supporters in the commons throughout the period and that these were the leaders in the attack upon Buckingham in 1626.[67] Much of our information concerning the relations between the peerage and the Puritan members of the commons is provided by a curious letter written in that year by Sir James Bagg. Addressed to Buckingham, this letter attempted to prove that much of the opposition to the duke in the commons had been fostered by the orders of a few great lords. In his specific accusations, Bagg hinted that Sir Walter Erle was the *protégé* of Viscount Say and Sele and that a whole dozen of commons members had found places in the house through the influence of Pembroke. The latter's adherents were quite eminent and included such names as Sir Benjamin Rudyerd, Henry Sherfield, Dr. Turner, and Sir John Eliot.[68] To be sure, evidence that the Puritan lords supported members in the lower house is rather scarce, but at the same time it is certain that the Puritans would wish such facts to be suppressed.

---

[66] Great Britain, Public Record Office, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I*, Vol. XV (1639-40) (London: Longman & Co., 1877), p. 609.

[67] Willson, pp. 183-186. See also Violet A. Rowe, "The Influence of the Earls of Pembroke on Parliamentary Elections, 1625-41," *English Historical Review*, L (1935), 242-256.

[68] *Cal. S.P., Dom., Chas. I*, Vol. XXIII (Addenda: March 1625-January 1649) (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1897), pp. 112-113.

With the guarantee of the election of pro-Puritan members to the parliament, the Puritans were in a position to carry on their political agitation in increasing intensity until the storm broke in 1640. The movement already had a small number of adherents among the lords, and these, together with the commons members and the Puritan leadership outside the parliament, constituted a party which was an effective obstacle in the path of Charles's ecclesiastical policy. To achieve this effectiveness, it seems likely that some sort of directive, informal organization existed which successfully magnified the political influence of the movement to a degree all out of proportion to its size. With this development, Puritanism took its place as one of the principal factors in the opposition, and by lending religious sanction to the parliamentarian cause, added considerably to the eventual triumph of the popular party.

CHAPTER III

THE NEW PURITAN PARTY: THE CLERGY AND THE PARLIAMENT

However necessary to the understanding of the movement, the Puritan laity do not constitute a clear guide for following the history of the Puritan party. Deeply involved in social, economic, and constitutional issues, the lay Puritans were animated by a complexity of motive which defies exact analysis. All attempts to isolate the religious opposition, such as we have essayed in the preceding chapter, tend to blur and fade into the multiplicity of grievances which comprised the opposition to the crown under the early Stuarts. In the Puritan clergy--though ultimately they may have been of less importance--these outlines become clearer. Although not entirely immune, the Puritan ministers, by training and profession, were probably more emancipated from competing interests than their lay associates.

The Puritan clergy early came to focus their attention on the parliament as the agency for the articulation of their grievances, but throughout the history of the movement the ties which bound them to the legislature were somewhat weak and to a certain extent indirect. In the first place, their primary concern was with religious reformation, and it was only after they had been repulsed by the crown and disowned by the convocation that they came to regard parliament as the only avenue of protest against the conservative Anglicanism of James and the more extreme high church propensities of his son. Moreover, it was impossible for the Puritan divines to champion their cause in parliament since the lower clergy had been excluded from that assembly after the fourteenth century on the grounds that they were represented in the convocation.

As a consequence of this condition, the role of the Puritan clergy in the parliamentary opposition has always remained somewhat vague. Some parliament men, as we have seen, were firmly attached to the Puritan way of life, and these seem to have comprised small blocs of active and enthusiastic supporters in both houses. Beyond these adherents, the influence which Puritanism wielded in the parliament can be at least partially ascribed to the fact that there were great numbers of men, who, without actually accepting Puritanism in all its aspects, were willing to come to the defence of a movement that had become identified in the popular mind with militant Protestantism struggling against Anglo-Catholicizing tendencies. To these two groups of men, the Puritan preachers seem to have been content to consign the fortunes of their cause, but they were nevertheless interested in maintaining close contact with them. To keep the principles and objectives of the movement constantly before the parliament, to familiarize and popularize Puritan concepts with the whole body in both houses, and to advise and exhort the Puritan members--these seem to have been the objectives of the Puritan clergy.

The opportunities which the clergy possessed for this purpose were far fewer in the house of lords than in the house of commons. The upper house was too conservative and aristocratic to be attracted toward Puritanism, while the episcopal bench was animated by a lively antagonism toward the movement. The only place where we find Puritan clergy in close relation with the upper house is in the case of individual Puritan lords. A number of the Puritan lords must have had prominent Puritan clergy as chaplains. Such a peer as the elder Lord Brooke, for instance, gave Preston a pension,[1] while his adopted son kept Peter Sterry in his household.[2] Occasionally we get glimpses of the intimacy which could exist between the Puritan peer and his clerical _protégé_ as when Warwick used his influence to protect the imprisoned Hugh Peter when the latter was in trouble with the Bishop of London. "Give mild Answers and let me hear what is done," he wrote the divine, "and I shall come to you," and signed his note "Your asshured friend & Patron."[3] In all likelihood, Puritan divines were also employed by the peers as political propaganda writers. Such, at any rate, was the case with Preston, who was approached by a peer interested in frustrating the Spanish match. As Ball tells the story,

> A very Honourable and able Member of the House of Lords prevailed with Master Preston to write some arguments against it; and though there were severe Edicts and Proclamations against scandalous Papers, and intermeddling with mysteries of State, yet he promised it should be scattered and divulged unto fit persons, and none should know from whence, or from whom it came . . . . . And so it was copied out, and spread among those of the Parliament they thought fit, but the Authour of it never known.[4]

Close associations of this sort may well have been quite frequent, but their private and quasi-secret character has preserved them from discovery.

The house of commons presented much greater possibilities to the Puritan divines, and it is to this subject that we shall devote the remainder of this chapter. The avenues of influence which the clergy possessed were principally four: the sermon, the petition, personal contact with members, and correspondence with members. Each had its own peculiar character, and, as will be seen, the Puritan ministers were adept at employing that particular method which best conformed with their objective at any particular moment. In any study of Puritan propaganda methods, it is worth keeping in mind that the tract, a fifth means by which the Puritan preacher strove to further the movement, must have exerted a powerful influence on parliament men, just as it did on the nation at large. That this weapon does not come under consideration here is due to the manifest impossibility of determining how deeply such literature penetrated to the commons' ranks.

---

[1] Ball, in Clarke, p. 480.

[2] Vivian de Sola Pinto, _Peter Sterry, Platonist and Puritan 1613-1672_ (Cambridge: University Press, 1934), p. 11.

[3] Stearns, _Essex Institute Historical Collections_, LXXI (1935), 310-311.

[4] Ball, in Clarke, p. 489.

Undoubtedly, the most characteristic of Puritan mediums was the sermon. In the hands of the Puritan, this type of address had become a plain, yet highly effective exhortation to the performance of the Puritan version of Christian duty. It is probable that even before the assembling of the parliaments the Puritan sermon was put to good use in influencing the election of favorable candidates. The institution of the election sermon took deep root in the Puritan movement--a fact which was displayed in the freer conditions which obtained in the New World and in the later England of 1640. But Puritan election sermons were certainly characteristic of the earlier period as well, and we hear that in 1621 Samuel Ward, the able Puritan minister at Ipswich, was censured for intimating in a sermon that "a religious care was to be taken in such elections, and heed to be taken of such as were of suspected affection to our religion."[5]

It was after the sitting of parliament, however, that the

---

[5] Birch, Court and Times of James I, II, 232.

Puritan sermon exerted its greatest influence. The most valuable opportunity for the exercise of this rhetoric on the commons members was afforded by the general fast which the parliament and city of London customarily kept during the early weeks of every session. First proposed in the commons of 1581 by Paul Wentworth, the brother of the notoriously outspoken Puritan, Peter, the resolution for the fast was passed only to be immediately denounced by the watchful queen.[6] Another more successful effort was made in the last parliament of James,[7] and the custom seems to have been definitely launched by the first parliament of Charles.[8] A mark of the legislature's growing self-consciousness and sense of responsibility as well as of its religious leanings, the fast day rapidly became a Puritan holiday of vast propaganda potentialities when the city churches would resound to the cry for humiliation before God and the call for reformation to regain the divine favor. For some time the house had taken communion at St. Margaret's Westminster in order to avoid the "copes and wafer-cakes" of the abbey,[9] and in 1625 the members determined to keep the fast in the same church, presumably for the same reason.[10] Throughout the day's services, sometimes nine hours in length,[11] the commons listened to the sermons of the two and sometimes three eminent preachers whom they had invited for the occasion.

---

[6] C.J., I, 118-119.

[7] Ibid., pp. 671, 715-716, 675, 722.

[8] Ibid., p. 799; Debates in 1625, p. 6.

[9] C.J., I, 463; The Letters of John Chamberlain, ed. Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939), I, 525.

[10] C.J., I, 799; Debates in 1625, p. 6.

[11] Diary of Walter Yonge, Esq. Justice of the Peace, and M.P. for Honiton, Written at Colyton and Axminster, Co. Devon, from 1604 to 1628, ed. George Roberts ("Camden Society Publications," XLI [London, 1848]), 85-86.

During the years 1625-1629, the preachers whom the house invited to address them were predominantly of the Puritan stamp. In the first parliament of Charles, the service was performed by a trio of celebrated London ministers, Josias Shute, Richard Holdsworth, and John Preston.[12] Shute, the rector of St. Mary Woolnoth, was widely known for his erudite sermons but in spite of his later nomination to the Westminster Assembly, does not seem to have had any close connection with the Puritan movement. Holdsworth, on the other hand, was the young rector of St. Peter-le-Poer and just starting on a distinguished career in moderate Puritanism which was to lead him in 1637 to the mastership of Emmanuel College, the Puritan stronghold at Cambridge. Though both Shute and Holdsworth were able and respected ministers, neither was the equal of Preston. Lecturer at Trinity church, Cambridge, master of Emmanuel, Cambridge, and preacher to the lawyers at Lincoln's Inn, Preston was undoubtedly the most influential of the Puritan preacher-politicians.

The parliament of 1626 was dissolved before the fast was held, but in the two sessions of the parliament of 1628-1629, the fast day preachers were again largely of Puritan complexion. At the opening of the parliament in March, Jeremiah Dyke, the rather obscure but nevertheless staunch Puritan pastor at Epping in Essex, was asked to preach together with Walter Balcanquhall, the dean of Rochester and certainly no Puritan.[13] These two ministers may have indeed addressed the commons but since in a later passage in the Commons Journal the customary remuneration was directed to Dyke and "Dr. Burgesse,"[14] there is some reason to think that the latter was substituted for Balcanquhall without a notice to that effect being entered in the Journal. This preacher would seem to be Cornelius Burgess, who though he had not yet acquired much stature in 1628, was later to be described by Clarendon as sharing with Stephen Marshall the distinction of possessing more power with the parliament of 1641 than Archbishop Laud ever had at court.[15] Apparently unsatisfied with making this fast suffice for the whole parliament, the commons in January, 1629, made preparations for a fast in the second session. The services for this session--the last before the revolutionary parliaments of 1640--were administered by a trio of lesser importance, though again Puritans were in the majority. One of the preachers, William Fitz-Jeoffery of Cornwall, is difficult to identify, although it may well be that he was connected with a number of Cornish clergymen of the same name.[16] The other two, however, were almost certainly of Puritan persuasion, the first being Harris, the lecturer of St. Margaret's Westminster, and the second, another Harris, Robert, the rector of Hanwell, Oxford and an unwavering parliamentarian throughout the Civil Wars.[17]

---

[12] C.J., I, 799, 800; Debates in 1625, pp. 6, 29.

[13] C.J., I, 875, 878.

[14] Ibid., p. 883.

Out of all eight sermons delivered to the house between 1625 and 1629, only two seem to have been published: those of Preston in 1625 and of Dyke in 1628. Nevertheless, these addresses, together with what we know of fast day sermons after the period under consideration, provide considerable evidence of the effect they were calculated to produce.

---

[15] Edward [Hyde], Earl of Clarendon, The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, to Which is now Added an Historical View of Affairs in Ireland (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1826), II, 25.

[16] During the ejections of the period 1640-1660, John Fitzgeffery, a cleric of Anglican sympathies, was removed from the living of St. Dominick's parish, Cornwall (Mary Coate, Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum 1642-1660 [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933], p. 383). An Alexander Fitzgeoffrey displayed Puritanical inclinations during the reign of Elizabeth (A. L. Rowse, Tudor Cornwall [London: Jonathan Cape, 1941], p. 355).

[17] C.J., I, 927; Commons Debates for 1629, pp. 42, 129, 83.

Strangely alike throughout, both sermons took as their theme the imminence of divine wrath against England if reformation was not immediately undertaken. "As wee desire to preuent the fatall ruine of this renowmed [sic] Church and Kingdom," declared Dyke, "so in the feare of God be wee perswaded to take warning";[18] and Preston admonished his hearers not to be deceived by the continuation of normal existence, since though punishment might be deferred somewhat, yet God would strike at last.[19] To substantiate his assertion of the peril in which England stood, Dyke enumerated the many warnings which the nation had received from God. First, the Word itself had cautioned England through Revelation[20] and through the mouths of the ministers who by "comparing things present with things past and looking into God's ancient wayes may see in the general that mischiefe is comming, and so from God giue warning."[21] Another premonition was to be found in the distresses of Bohemia, the Palatinate, and Denmark, and in a curiously prophetic passage, Dyke asserted that God had given the sword a commission to go throughout the lands and that England could not long escape its blow.[22] Perhaps more than in any other warning, disaster was to be seen in the very evident departure of God from the land with the concomitant rise in idolatry, popery, and Arminianism--to the Puritan mind, all synonyms for Roman Catholicism and high church doctrines--and with the obvious increase in doctrinal corruption and moral depravity among the clergy.[23] In addition to this desertion of God's truth, the divine disfavor was further instanced in the nation's growing enfeeblement so that England, once terrible to others, was now openly mocked--perhaps a pointed allusion to Buckingham's recent defeat at the Isle of Rhé.[24]

---

[18] Jeremiah Dyke, A Sermon Preached at the Publicke Fast to the Commons House of Parliament April. 5th. 1628 (London: R. Mylbourne, 1628), p. 27.

[19] John Preston, A Sermon Preached at a Generall Fast before the Commons-House of Parliament: the Second of Iuly, 1625 (London: 1633), appended to John Preston, The Saints Qvalification (London: N. Bourne, 1634), pp. 271-274.

[20] Dyke, p. 22. [21] Ibid., p. 9. [22] Ibid., pp. 10-12, 23.

Having thus pictured the destruction which hung over England, the ministers turned in the later parts of their sermons to the sole remedy which would avert the nation's doom. To Preston, this remedy was "zeal" and to Dyke it was "reformation" but in both cases the description was of something very like Puritanism. After pointing out that there were wicked men in the kingdom crying down religion and zeal under the name of preciseness, Preston told the commons of 1625, "It were well, if some meanes were used to prevent this." "If it be zeale that turnes away the wrath of God," he went on, "we should doe well then to nourish and cherish them that are zealous.[25] Three years later, Dyke was inclined to be less moderate and went far beyond Preston's insistence that the Puritans merely be left unmolested. Though the people may fast and pray and the parliament may labor, he declared, yet anything less than a complete reformation would be but a "cock-boat" to deceive the nation, not an "ark" to save it.[26] Such an "ark" as he desired, he explained, could be built only by the "publique reformation of all such nationall prouocations as haue made God angry."[27] As a corollary to these appeals for the advancement of Puritanism, both ministers asked that the ancient Protestant faith be protected from the attempts to corrupt or replace it. Let it not suffer "the least detriment,"[28] charged Preston, while Dyke expressed a similar plea that the house would keep "our old God, and our old truth" in England.[29] In this connection, the two preachers demanded justice on the high church party and the Roman Catholics. While Preston was somewhat vague in his request that punishment be inflicted on the devotees of idolatry and superstition,[30] Dyke was bold enough to ask outright for the suppression of the Arminians and for the execution of the penal laws against the papists.[31]

---

[23] *Ibid*., pp. 17-21, 24-25. [24] *Ibid*., pp. 20-21, 25.

[25] Preston, p. 286. [26] Dyke, pp. 38-42. [27] *Ibid*., p. 38.

Like all Puritan appeals since the genesis of the movement, the fast day sermons reserved a prominent place for the demand for an able, sound, preaching ministry. Such a demand in itself was deeply critical of the Establishment and of the many Anglican clergy who could not or did not choose to conform to the Puritan conception of the ministry. The house was not obliged to infer the criticism, however, for Dyke explicitly asked the commons to purge God's house of all "filthinesse" and specifically attacked vacant pastorates, poor maintenance, and unscrupulous impropriators;[32] and Preston in a rather ambiguous passage pled for the removal of the "dogs that will devoure," "those that endeavour to put out the light, that so they may the better prevaile, and teach their doctrines of darkenesse."[33] As always, the commons was forcefully reminded that many souls in Wales and the northern counties were perishing for want of knowledge, and that they would continue to do so until the able, preaching ministry was established.[34]

---

[28] Preston, p. 297.

[29] Dyke, pp. 42-43. [30] Preston, pp. 295, 297.

[31] Dyke, pp. 42-43, 46-47. [32] _Ibid_., p. 44.

[33] Preston, p. 299. This may refer to Roman Catholicism rather than to high church Anglicanism, though both parties were obnoxious to Puritans.

Every device was used in the fast day sermons to strengthen the appeal to the members of the house. For one thing, all the power of language was utilized to invoke the religious and humanitarian emotions of the members, and Dyke constantly employed such phrases as "Bee ye entreated in the bowels of the Lord Iesus Christ"[35] and "Thinke that you heare the Church both at home and abroad, crying out vnto you, An Arke, An Arke, for Gods loue prouide vs an Arke."[36] Not merely sympathy, however, but action as well was desired, and there seems to have been an attempt to elicit a willingness to act among those who otherwise would have been little more than well-wishers. To spur these laggards, Preston warned the audience that the fast in itself was worthless if reformation did not issue from it, for God ignores mere lip service and "judgeth every man according to his workes."[37] Furthermore, every man was made to feel the tremendous responsibility of his election to parliament, in a manner which sometimes bordered on intimidation. Dyke addressed the house as "You . . . . the great Senate of the land, vpon whom our eyes and hopes next vnder God and the King are,"[38] and Preston sternly informed them that "the Lord markes what every man doth for his Church, he observes who is zealous, and who sits still . . . . and how much every man doth."[39] As the sermons drew near their conclusions, the exhortations became more intense. Earlier in his address Preston had proved the ultimate impotence of princes in the face of the fact that only God is the author of good and evil,[40] and now he further encouraged the commons with the prophecy that the plague currently raging in England would remain until the work of reformation was accomplished.[41] Even these arguments, however, were surpassed by the eloquence of Dyke in the sermon of 1628. In this address, Dyke urged the members to set about building the "ark" with speed and thoroughness but warned them that there must be unity among the builders or all would be lost.[42] As a last counsel, the commons was advised to take courage and set to work bravely, putting the welfare of the state before their own private concerns. Then in a somewhat ambiguous but nevertheless pointed statement, he followed up this advice with the reminder that it was better to perish for a kingdom than with it, and concluded with the command, "Doe you arise and build, and the God of heauen prosper you."[43]

---

[34] *Ibid*., pp. 298-299. [35] Dyke, p. 35.

[36] *Ibid*., p. 37. [37] Preston, p. 285.

[38] Dyke, p. 35. [39] Preston, p. 294.

Though the sermons were similar in outline and in the methods of attack which they utilized, there was some difference in the degree of vehemence with which they were inspired. Unlike that of Dyke, Preston's sermon gives the impression of having been written with great care in an effort to incline the house toward Puritanism while at the same time avoid giving unnecessary offense to the government. The point of the entire address was obviously to make fullest use of the power of words to impress the house with the necessity of halting the progress of God's wrath by reformation of the church. Yet throughout the work, the corruptions in the church were never very specifically referred to, though the import of his words must have been evident to every member of his audience. Behind this delicacy was most likely the fact that Buckingham was in the act of making friendly overtures to the Puritans--indeed Preston himself was playing the part of the duke's protégé--and doubtless Preston did not wish to portray the corruptions of the Establishment with too embarrassing concreteness. Then, too, the king had just ascended the throne and it is likely that Preston, though not disposed to compromise, shared the hesitancy of all men to attack the government without giving it a chance to prove itself.[44]

---

[40] Ibid., p. 261. Preston's exact statement was: "Indeed wee care for the favour of Princes, and think that they can hurt us, or doe us good; and therefore wee are so intent about them, so busily occupied about them, but this would not worke on us so much if wee did beleeve . . . . that God onely is the Author of good and evill."

[41] Ibid., pp. 299-300. [42] Dyke, pp. 47-49. [43] Ibid., p. 49.

If such considerations diminished the force of the Puritan message to the house of commons in 1625, no such scruples were entertained in the sermon of Jeremiah Dyke in 1628. In the three years which had intervened, the government had indeed proved itself, and the Puritans were forced to realize that for the first time in their history they had to contend with a vigorous and aggressive high church policy supported by the crown. The resulting sermon was a masterpiece of Puritan rhetoric--an indictment of the existing corruptions and an impassioned exhortation to reformation, which even over the space of three centuries still exercises considerable power on the reader. Doubtless, it would be somewhat naive to imagine that the house would be converted to the Puritan program through no other agency than the eloquence of Puritan sermons delivered near the opening of the session. Nevertheless, the fast day sermons, exercising some influence over the more moderate center of the house and acting in combination with a zealous Puritan minority, could be highly useful to the Puritan party. The Puritans were well aware of the value of the institution, and in 1640 they used the fast day sermons as the platform from which to launch their attacks on Anglicanism.[45] By 1629, Charles himself was awake to the propaganda effect of the sermons, and though he granted the parliament's petition for a fast, he complained that "the chief Motive of your Petition, being the deplorable condition of the Reformed Churches abroad, is too true: . . . . but certainly, fighting will do them more good than fasting; tho' I do not wholly disallow of the latter: yet I must tell you, that the custom of fasting every Session, is but lately begun, and I confess, I am not fully satisfied with the necessity of it at this time."[46]

---

[44] In a similar spirit, the commons in 1625 resolved to forego their customary consideration of grievances (C.J., I, 800; Debates in 1625, pp. 9-12).

The Puritan influence exerted at the fast day sermons was ably seconded by the sermons of the Puritan preachers at the inns of court. The value of these preacherships to the Puritans lay in the distinction of the audience, for the lawyers of the inns were strongly represented in the house and were appointed in large numbers--sometimes *en masse*--to important committees. No more telling illustration of the pre-eminence of the lawyers in the house can be made than the assertion that of the leaders of the commons in the first three parliaments of Charles--Coke, Eliot, Wentworth, and Pym--each in some way or another was connected with the inns, while a catalogue of the lesser lawyer-members could be made that would be almost equally imposing.[47]

---

[45] See Cornelius Burges, *A Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons Assembled in Parliament. at Their Pvblique Fast, Novem. 17. 1640* (London: P. Stephens and C. Meredith, 1641); Stephen Marshall, *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons, now Assembled in Parliament, at Their Publike Fast, November 17. 1640* (London: Samuel Man, 1641).

[46] Rushworth, I, 651; *Commons Debates for 1629*, pp. 28-29.

[47] Coke and Pym were, of course, prominent in the affairs of the inns, while all four men received part of their education there.

To minister to these important congregations, the Puritans were fortunate in having some of their ablest divines. Though the Inner Temple and the Middle Temple were served by the master of the Temple, a minister nominated by the crown, the preacherships at both Lincoln's Inn and Gray's Inn were filled by Puritans of the most eminent stature. Although there is some confusion on the point, the post at Lincoln's Inn seems to have been occupied jointly by John Preston and Edward Reynolds.[48] Preston we have already met as the preacher before the commons in 1625, and despite the tremendous pressure of his many other duties, he continued to serve the congregation of lawyers until he burned himself out and died at the age of forty in 1628. After this event, the pulpit at Lincoln's Inn was occupied solely by Reynolds,[49] a moderate parliamentarian throughout the Civil Wars and the only Puritan to accept a bishopric at the Restoration. The equally important post at Gray's Inn was filled by the "heavenly" Richard Sibbes, the master of St. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge, and one of the leaders in feoffees of impropriations venture.[50]

That the Puritans highly regarded the preacherships for propaganda purposes is a fact of which there can be little doubt. The audiences at the inns were comprised not only of celebrated leaders of the commons but of distinguished figures in the City as well, and such an audience could not have failed to make an appeal to the eloquence of the Puritan ministers. "It suted with him," wrote Thomas Ball, the pupil and later biographer of Preston, "to have an opportunity to exercise his Ministry in a considerable and intelligent congregation, where he was assured, many Parliament men, and others of his best acquaintance would be his hearers";[51] and though Reynolds resigned his pulpit at Lincoln's Inn to accept the living at Bramston, Northamptonshire in 1631,[52] Richard Sibbes refused an important post at Trinity College, Dublin, on the grounds that he was of greater service in his English positions as preacher at Gray's and as master of Catherine Hall.[53]

---

[48] The Records of the Honorable Society of Lincoln's Inn. The Black Books, II (London, 1898), 234-235.

[49] Records of Lincoln's Inn, II, 277-278.

[50] The Pension Book of Gray's Inn (Records of the Honourable Society) 1569-1669, ed. Reginald J. Fletcher (London: Chiswick Press, 1901), p. 224.

Unfortunately, but few sermons of these preachers can be identified as having been preached in the inns of court, and even these may well have been delivered outside the period 1625-1629. Of the sermons delivered before the lawyers, a great many were doctrinal and therefore unconcerned with the political events of the day except in so far as they tended to intensify the Puritanism of their hearers. Nevertheless, there were some which dealt at some length with the Puritan aspirations and with the afflictions which frustrated those aspirations. Richard Sibbes in The Church's Visitation repeated the familiar attacks against the innovators in doctrine, and dwelt on the urgent necessity for reformation.[54] A variation of this theme was preached in a sermon of John Preston, some time before 1628 (the year of his death). Apparently delivered in a time of discouragement in an effort to revive fallen spirits, Preston counselled his audience to retain hope while expounding the doctrine that God brings men to extremity only to deliver them at the darkest moment. "When you see the greatest tryals befall the Church and people of God," he declared, "bee assured by this which hath beene said, that some great benefit is comming to them."[55]

---

[51] Ball, in Clarke, p. 494.

[52] Records of Lincoln's Inn, II, 304 n.

[53] Works of James Ussher, XVI, 440-441.

[54] Works of Richard Sibbes, I, 376-383.

It is, of course, impossible to determine just how influential was the Puritan pulpit in the inns. That considerable power was wielded in at least one case is suggested by Thomas Ball, who in writing of Preston's part in the parliament of 1624, declared that "his Sermons at Lincolns-Inne much wrought upon the Parliament, so that a bold Petition was contrived and presented to the King."[56] Preston's ability, both as a skilful politician and a brilliant preacher, was doubtless extraordinary, but the influence of other preachers at the inns could not have been altogether negligible.

Though a powerful weapon in the hands of the skilled Puritan preacher, the sermon had several limitations. For one thing, the sermon could only address itself broadly to the need for reform and assert somewhat vaguely the program desired. On every occasion the minister had to exercise extreme caution in outlining specific demands for fear of arousing the opposition of the house, always sensitive about its privileges and somewhat anticlerical as well. Thus, when it came to making actual demands, Preston was obliged to become half-apologetic and to content himself with little more than remarking, "I say no more, but commend it to every man in his place, wishing that you would let it be your generall care to encourage true Religion and Zeale."[57] In addition to this disadvantage, moreover, the sermon was a public oration, always delivered in the presence of a large number of people and frequently printed as well. Since Puritanism was a quasi-illegal movement, it was usually the case that its deepest aspirations and its favorite plans could not be exposed to the world's view. As a consequence of this condition, the Puritan ministers frequently sought more direct and more secretive means of bringing their appeals to the attention of the members of the house.

---

[55] John Preston, A Sermon Preached at Lincolnes-Inne on Gen. xxij.xiv. (London: A. Crooke, 1635), p. 23.

[56] Ball, in Clarke, p. 502.

[57] Preston, Sermon Preached at a Generall Fast, p. 287.

Unfortunately, only the barest evidence of such activity exists, and to some extent resort must be made to the doubtful historical practice of looking to Puritan methods after 1640 to serve as a guide for 1625-29. Nevertheless, though these Puritan methods cannot be definitely established beyond a doubt, there is sufficient material to throw some interesting light on the use which the Puritan clergy made of the petition, of personal contact with parliament men, and of correspondence with parliament men.

Like the sermon, the petition was usually publicly presented; but unlike it, it could exercise a certain directness in articulating its demands. Couched in respectful and submissive language but presenting abundant evidence in support of its complaints, the Puritan petition could often direct the attention of the commons in a way that was denied to the less factual, homiletical type of address. At the beginning of every parliament, a committee on religion was appointed and it is almost certain that a large portion of its business was concerned with the consideration of petitions on religion, though since we must rely on rather imperfect reports, there can be little certainty as to their number or importance.[58]

In one case during this period, a Puritan petition produced an issue of primary importance in the house. This was the appeal of two East Anglian Puritan clergymen, John Yates and Samuel Ward, against a high church canon of Windsor, Richard Montague. In 1624, Montague had written A New Gagg for an Old Goose, a book which was intended as a defense of Anglicanism against a Cantolic attack but which was deeply offensive to the Puritans. Although Pym reported to the house on the petition on May 13, 1624, the commons at first did nothing more than refer the matter to the attention of George Abbot, the archbishop of Canterbury.[59] In the parliament of 1625, however, the New Gagg and a more recent work of Montague's, the Appello Caesarem, were taken up in earnest and formed one of the primary sources of friction between the king and the commons.[60] The result of this quarrel was that Montague was censured by the house, and thus the high church party received a major, though only temporary, setback.[61] In a similar manner in 1629, a petition directed the attention of the house to the objectionable high church practices of Montague's friend, the archdeacon John Cosin; and though he did not suffer punishment at this time, he was severely dealt with by the Long Parliament.[62]

---

[58] One insight into Puritan practice may be provided in the Portland papers, where among the calendared papers of Sir Robert Harley, a Puritan member, is found the bare notation of "a list of petitions to be made on a day of humiliation"(Great Britain, Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report 14, Appendix, Part 2. The Manuscripts of His Grace, the Duke of Portland, Preserved at Welbeck Abbey, III [London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1894], 23). If indeed a number of Puritan petitions were presented to the house on the fast day, it speaks much for Puritan shrewdness in choosing the right psychological moment to approach the commons with their demands. There is some reason to think, however, that the list was merely a program of Sir Robert's personal devotions.

[59] C.J., I, 788.

[60] Ibid., pp. 802, 805-806, 807, 809-810, 811, 812; Debates in 1625, pp. 26, 33-35, 46-53, 61-63, 69-71.

[61] C.J., I, 851, 871, 911.

As these instances demonstrate, the Puritan petition could be a formidable instrument at times, especially when combined with the support of the Puritan membership in the house. In spite of this success, however, it does not seem that during the period 1625-1629 the Puritans employed the petition to an extent anything like their practice in 1640 and 1641, when it was one of the principal means for the overthrow of episcopacy.

Though evidence of the Puritan use of petition may be considered shadowy, that of the personal contact between Puritan preachers and members of the house is even more unsubstantial. That this is so is primarily due to the fact that it is impossible to recapture unrecorded conversations. To be sure, from time to time we have indications that the Puritan clergy did not hesitate to lobby for their interests with the commons members. Thus, at a meeting of the committee on religion in 1629, Sir Robert Phelips strengthened a charge against the high church party with testimony which he had received from a Dr. Marshall, and a certain Oliver Cromwell made a similar assertion on the authority of the Puritan preacher, Thomas Beard.[63]

On the whole, however, such conversations left no trace, and research is generally forced to be content with tracing the opportunities which the Puritan clergy possessed for such personal lobbying. Altogether, the indications of friendship between Puritan ministers and members of the house are not over-scarce. Preston on at least one occasion visited at the home of a commons leader in the West,[64] while in 1622 Sibbes wrote to the future

---

[62] _Ibid_., p. 926. [63] _Commons Debates for 1629_, p. 59.

[64] Ball, in Clarke, p. 504.

Archbishop Ussher a letter of introduction for his "worthy friends" Sir Nathaniel Rich and Thomas Crew, both prominent members of the commons and important in the Puritan oppostion.[65] Some of these relationships seem to have been quite intimate. Such, for instance, was that between the commons leader, Denzil Holles, and the great Puritan preacher at Dorchester, John White, and shortly after Holles was imprisoned in 1629 the governor of the Tower reported that White "came under the window of Mr. Hollis and would have spoken unto him" but was "prevented by his keeper and put out of the Towers."[66] Finally, scholarly men in the house may well have been interested in maintaining correspondence with the intellectually minded Puritan divines, and in the letters of Ussher we seem to discern a circle which included John Selden, Sir Simonds D'Ewes, and Sir Robert Cotton, as well as Samuel Ward, the great Puritan scholar at Cambridge.[67]

Not only through the attraction of friendship, however, did the Puritan ministers come into contact with the members of the commons, for they were sometimes thrown together in the course of their work as well. Certainly one of the most important points of contact must have been the preacherships at the inns of court where there was ample opportunity for conferring with the sympathetic lawyer-members on the affairs of the movement. It is likely, however, that still more important influence (though perhaps less widely diffused) was exerted in the course of carrying out a project on which Puritan clergy and laity both participated --the feoffees of impropriations venture. This clever scheme for gaining control of the church by buying up lay impropriations to benefices was presided over by a board composed of twelve men--four ministers, four lawyers, and four citizens of London--which thus constituted a sort of nerve center for the movement. Preston was probably the guiding spirit of the scheme, and Sibbes, John Davenport, Charles Offspring, and Richard Stock--all prominent Puritan clergy--were members of the board, while the link with the commons was supplied by the person of Christopher Sherland. The board met frequently, and though there is little evidence to establish the assertion, it may have been a center where party plans were hatched. Although the activities of the board were discovered and the feoffees were put on trial in 1633, the board was operative throughout the period of parliamentary sittings.[68]

---

[65] Works of James Ussher, XVI, 395.

[66] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 241, quoting Great Britain, Public Record Office, State Papers, Domestic, Charles I, 142, No. 52.

[67] Works of James Ussher, XV, XVI, passim.

This evidence, of course, is primarily circumstantial, and it is perhaps with some risk that the historian trusts himself to it at all. Nevertheless, it is definitely known that Puritan ministers wielded great personal influence on parliament in the events following 1640, and the additional fact that attempts were made to sway the commons by other mediums makes for a strong presumption that personal contacts were not allowed to lie unutilized.

Like personal contact, the private letter had the advantage of being both personal and secret, though, of course, the size of its audience was considerably smaller than that of either the sermon or petition. That the Puritan clergy employed such a medium in their endeavor to maintain contact between themselves and the Puritan minority in the house can be adequately established from the existing evidence, though that evidence is far too meager to permit many general conclusions being drawn. Unhappily, only two small sources of material exist for the American historian, principally because the letters of rather obscure Puritan ministers have not been deemed valuable materials for publication. The largest body of such correspondence--and even this is exceedingly shallow--has been calendared in the papers of the commons member, Sir Robert Harley, in the Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports. During the third decade of the seventeenth century, Sir Robert carried on a correspondence with William Gouge, the lecturer at Blackfriars, and Thomas Taylor, the rector of St. Mary Aldermanbury, as well as with his own pastor, Thomas Pierson, the rector at Sir Robert's seat of Brampton Bryan. It is somewhat disappointing that in most cases, the letters were concerned with little more than supplying Sir Robert with news of the fortunes of the party. Thus in 1627, Thomas Taylor notified Harley that the plans for a parliament had apparently been dropped since the king had received a loan of money from the City,[69] while in the following year Thomas Pierson sent his patron news of the election in the county while at the same time he gave expression to his despair that any good would come out of the coming convocation.[70] A little later, this same minister exulted at the "'good and heavenly newes' concerning the day of Humiliation and the resolution of your house to begin with the cause of God"[71]--an additional testimony of the Puritan adherence to the institution of the fast day.

---

[68] See below, chap. v.

Beyond these papers of Sir Robert Harley, the sole evidence we possess is two letters of John Preston. In spite of the fact that these letters do not exist even in calendared form and resort must be made to Ball's account of them, they prove far more interesting than those of Harley. The first letter was elicited by the fact that unfavorable reports were being spread concerning Preston's participation in a conference on Montague's books. In an endeavor to bring about a decision in the dispute caused by the publication of that high churchman's works, two Puritan peers had arranged a conference of four ministers, of whom Preston was one. Though the conference seems to have ended without the question being settled, it was widely noised about that the hierarchy had bested the Puritans. This rumor evidently alarmed and offended many parliament men, and Preston, somewhat alarmed himself at their indignation, found himself obliged to write letters to them, giving the Puritan version of the conference.[72]

---

[69] Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report 14, Appendix, Part 2, III, 22.

[70] Ibid., p. 23. [71] Ibid., p. 25.

Apparently the Puritan correspondence was not confined to newsletters, however, for in at least one instance Preston advised direct action against the government. For several years, Preston had been the favorite of the Duke of Buckingham, but by the second parliament of Charles he, like the nation as a whole, had become estranged from him. Convinced that Buckingham had deserted the Puritan cause for that of Catholicism on the Continent and that of high church Anglicanism in England, Preston exerted his influence to bring about a parliamentary attack on the duke. He was evidently working in close accord with one of the members from Northamptonshire and, as Thomas Ball records it, "to him the Doctor [i.e. Preston] in a letter discovers all, shews him the hopelesse posture of the Duke, how much they both were disappointed in him, lays some directions what to do and urgeth activenesse."[73] Although it is difficult to determine exactly for whom this letter was meant, it is likely that the recipient was a member of the Puritan minority in the house, and this likelihood is increased by the fact that Ball tells us that he was a man "with whom the Doctor used to communicate affairs."[74] At any rate, it is quite certain that Preston's letter was closely connected with the efforts of the commons house in 1626 to impeach Buckingham, and since Preston was one of the leaders of the party, it may well have contained a promise of Puritan support to the house in that endeavor.

---

[72] Ball, in Clarke, p. 511. [73] Ibid., p. 514.

Though it would be hazardous to draw many conclusions from so small a store of evidence, it is nevertheless true that the available material does demonstrate that some Puritan clergy were in correspondence with some members of the commons. A large number of these communications may have been mere newsletters as were those of Sir Robert Harley but in the two Preston letters we catch a brief glimpse of the important political manoeuvering in which the Puritan ministers engaged in the attempt to realize the goals of the party.

Despite the data accumulated in this chapter to describe the contacts which Puritan ministers established with the members of the house of commons, it is important that the case be not exaggerated. Puritanism was developing a strong lay leadership and this especially came to the fore in the parliament, so it was not necessary to depend on the ministers for detailed guidance. In all probability, the clergy did not risk arousing the latent anticlericalism of the house by frequently attempting to interfere too directly in the legislature's affairs. But surreptitiously, a steady stream of propaganda and exhortation could be directed at the members through the use of the letter and personal contact, while the sermon--and the petition to some extent--could be utilized to the same effect under the guise of exercising the ministerial prerogative of spiritual counsel. It was these techniques, tremendously expanded and developed, which were, after 1640, to bring the ministers' power and influence to their zenith.

---

[74] Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

THE ALLIANCE WITH BUCKINGHAM

I

Parliament was to remain the Puritans' principal point of attack throughout the Elizabethan and early Stuart period. Nevertheless, Puritans were never loath to take advantage of whatever other opportunities emerged. That this was so was due to the fact that Puritanism was primarily a religious movement, and its principal political energies were directed toward the attainment of a thorough religious reformation. Since the realization of this goal was all-important, the Puritans were willing to lend support to any agency which promised to achieve this purpose. Thus, in the history of the movement, urgent representations were first made to the crown,[1] then to the convocation,[2] and finally, when both of these expedients failed, to parliament. Parliament, of course, was to remain the focus of their agitation, but from time to time they were willing to revert to one of their earlier efforts. Especially was this true when a change of rulers occurred. We have seen that an understanding was sought with James at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604. It is less widely known that a somewhat similar and more successful agreement with the favorite, Buckingham, was projected in the last feeble days of James and continued through the early period of Charles--an era that might well be denominated the reign of "King Buckingham."

---

[1] These appeals continued until at least 1585 (Knappen, pp. 283-284).

[2] *Ibid*., pp. 184-185.

At best, the alliance was only partially successful, and neither party seems to have regarded it as especially binding. That it worked at all was due to the fact that Buckingham was as willing as the Puritans to seek support wherever it might be found. If he possessed any long-term policy at all, it was that of opportunism and preservation of his own power. Possessing this type of mentality, Buckingham is certain to have discerned in the powerful Puritan faction a potential guarantee of his continuation in authority. At the same time, Buckingham's head was always full of grandiose programs which, in order to be carried out, required the support or at least the neutrality of a large portion of the population. Whether he was motivated by personal ambition or by state policies, it is quite clear that Buckingham's end in patronizing the Puritans was to weaken the parliamentary opposition and, if possible, actually to gain support for his own vast schemes. In describing the favorite's motives, one astute Puritan minister observed,"Buckingham was a wise man, ... saw those they called Puritans were growing, and in the Parliament were thought considerable, knew that the Kings affections might cool, and he might need friends."[3] Thus, just as the Puritans were seeking the government's favor for their program, Buckingham was seeking popularity for himself and popular support for his policies.

The link by which Buckingham hoped to consummate this alliance with the Puritans was John Preston who, though youthful, was already one of the most important of Puritan divines. Half minister and half politician, Preston was well equipped to act as Puritanism's envoy to the favorite. Having spent his early life in the expectation of entering the service of the state, Preston had been converted by the powerful preaching of John

---

[3] Ball, in Clarke, p. 491.

Cotton while he was yet a student at Cambridge. It is strongly indicative of the peculiar dynamic of Puritanism that after this experience, Preston's extraordinary political gifts were not suppressed but rather channelled into the service of the Puritan party in the church. "A subtle disputant and great politician," was the historian Fuller's estimate, "so that his foes must confess, that (if not having too little of the dove) he had enough of the serpent."[4] The acknowledgment of these abilities coupled with his staunch Puritanism enabled Preston to wield considerable influence over the Puritan party, and it was this, no doubt, that endeared him to Buckingham. To Fuller, he was a "patriarch of the presbyterian party"[5] and "was conceived to hold the helm of his own party, able to steer it to what point he pleased."[6] Even more significant as testimony of Preston's importance in the party councils is a statement of his biographer and one time assistant, Thomas Ball, who later became an influential Puritan divine in his own right. "The King," Ball wrote, "was . . . . assured that Master Preston had as strong an influence into the Puritans as the principal of the Jesuites, which was Aqua Viva, had upon them," and since Ball says nothing to deny the charge, it is likely that there was much truth in it.[7] At any rate, it seems certain that in setting himself up as the patron of Preston Buckingham conceived that he had allied himself with the Puritan party, and to a certain extent, this assumption was valid.

---

[4] Fuller, III, 355. Fuller's comment in his Worthies is equally revealing: "He was a perfect politician, and used (lapwing-like) to flutter most on that place which was furthest from his eggs; exact at the concealing of his intentions, with that simulation, which some make to lie in the marches of things lawful and unlawful" (Thomas Fuller, The History of the Worthies of England [London: Thomas Tegg, 1840], II, 517).

[5] Fuller, Church History, III, 355. [6] Ibid., p. 366.

[7] Ball, in Clarke, p. 485.

Preston had on several occasions impressed the court with his wit and tact and had already attracted the interest of several prominent noblemen when Buckingham became his patron sometime about the middle of the last decade of James's reign. Although it is not possible to speak with certainty here, it would seem that the initiative for this alliance sprang from Buckingham rather than from the Puritans. As recorded by Ball, Sir Ralph Freeman, one of the Masters of Requests and a kinsman by blood of Preston and by marriage of Buckingham, suggested to the favorite the policy of cultivating the Puritans through patronizing Preston and thus "lay a ground-work for his own security if tempests should arise." With the aid of Buckingham's secretary, John Packer, Buckingham was persuaded to recognize Preston as his _protégé_ and to present him with the post of chaplain in ordinary to the prince. It would seem that only James was opposed to this subsidization of Puritanism, but at last he too was won over by the consideration that favor might pry Preston loose from his associates.[8]

Perhaps because of this caution of the king, Buckingham does not seem to have been able to do very much for the Puritans during the first few years after this _rapprochement_ was effected. For the most part, such concessions as were obtained seem to have been in the nature of maintaining the _status quo_ in the church: the Puritans were not advanced, but at the same time they were, in a degree, protected from attacks of the ecclesiastical authorities. Although the rather secret character of his activities leaves only the barest evidence, it would seem that Preston was somewhat successful in securing greater liberty for Puritan preaching. During the Spanish journey of Charles and Buckingham, for instance, he was able to effect the restoration of the prominent Puritan divine, Arthur Hildersam, to his pastorate at Ashby-de-la-Zouche through the good offices of the Duchess of Buckingham and the Countess of Denbigh;[9] and accomplishments of a similar character are implied by Ball's rather vague remark that he "gave great hopes unto good ministers of fairer times, then had been formerly."[10]

---

[8] _Ibid_., p. 491.

Undoubtedly, the most valuable service of Preston to the Puritan cause during this early period was his success in negotiating the transfer of the mastership of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, from the old head to himself. The importance of this accomplishment stemmed from the fact that the preservation of the Puritan administration in several of the colleges of Cambridge was absolutely essential to the continuation of the movement. The Puritan college was always the fountain-head of the movement--a fact which is perhaps nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the prompt founding of Harvard College in Massachusetts.[11] Of the Puritan establishments at Cambridge, Emmanuel was one of the most important, and since Lawrence Chadderton, its head, was well advanced in years, it was feared that the time was approaching when Chadderton's death would be followed by the election of someone hostile to Puritanism. To prevent any such catastrophe, a coup was carefully planned and executed whereby Chadderton resigned the mastership and was immediately replaced by Preston, the whole transaction being completed before the news of the vacancy was abroad.[12] Buckingham's part in the affair was first, to prepare the way at court, and second, to induce the aged Chadderton to resign by reassuring him that his successor would preserve the Puritan tradition at Emmanuel. "I have moved his Majesty," he wrote the master, "concerning Master Preston's succeeding of you, in the Mastership of Emmanuel College, who is . . . . graciously pleased to recommend him to the place in especial manner before any other . . . . . I am likewise . . . . to put you out of all doubt, that another may be thrust upon you."[13] From incidents like this, it is evident that Buckingham could on occasion prevail with James, but he could not do so without arousing the king's resentment. The growth of Preston's influence is perhaps more clearly indicated by the opposition which he produced than by any other evidence. The king was rapidly losing patience with his favorite's patronage of the Puritans, and the Lord Keeper Williams, loyal churchman that he was, constantly remained Preston's most bitter enemy at court.

---

[9] Ibid., p. 501.

[10] Ibid.

[11] For the importance of the Puritan college, see Knappen, pp. 469-472; Winthrop S. Hudson, "The Morison Myth Concerning the Founding of Harvard College," Church History, VIII (1939), 148-159.

Heretofore, the Puritans' tie with Buckingham had produced valuable though not vastly important results. When Charles and Buckingham returned from Madrid in October of 1623, however, the alliance entered on a new and much more consequential phase. Embittered at the failure of their mission at the Spanish court, the prince and the duke determined to bring about the humiliation of that nation. In James, however, they met a check, for he had a deep-seated reluctance to abandon his life-long policy and enter into a war with Spain. Faced with this obstacle, Charles and Buckingham attempted to force the king from his position by ally-ing themselves with and by magnifying in every way possible the pressures of public and parliamentary opinion. To the mass of Englishmen--and especially English Puritans--Buckingham's plans for a crusade against Spain were immensely attractive, and out of the general enthusiasm emerged a tendency toward close co-operation with the favorite in a campaign to overcome James's hesitancy. It is true, of course, that this era of co-operation was but short-lived and that fundamentally Charles and Buckingham never identified themselves with the interests of the popular party. But superficial as this harmony may have been, at no time did Charles come closer to being the leader of the nation or Buckingham closer to being the idol of the Puritans.

---

[12] Ball, in Clarke, pp. 494-497; Birch, Court and Times of James I, II, 339-340.

[13] Ball, in Clarke, p. 496.

It was not only the sympathy of the Puritans for the duke's anti-Spanish policy which brought the alliance closer together, for, in addition, Buckingham was in great need of their support. His organization of the war party and his continual nagging of the king had alienated the latter to such an extent that Buckingham could no longer feel secure in the affections of the monarch. It was widely rumored about that Buckingham must either break the Spanish match or else he himself would be broken,[14] and it was indeed probable that the duke had committed himself to the war with Spain to such a degree that he could not suffer the continuation of peace without great loss and perhaps ruin. At any rate, Buckingham determined to act in concert with the Puritans, and as a result of this resolve, Preston became immensely important in the events that were to follow. "The People seemed now to have the better," was Ball's description of the period, "and Court-affairs for to decline and droop; Doctor Preston like another

---

[14] James Spedding (ed.), The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1861-1874), VII, 443.

Mordecai was very great, and the Prince his Master, and the Duke his friend, and the Courtiers eyes upon him, because they saw he came not thither for preferment, as all men else."[15]

When the last parliament of James opened in February, 1624, Buckingham lost no time in showing his new policy of cooperation with the Puritans. Indeed, the very fact that the parliament was summoned at all was a triumph for the alliance, for as an anonymous letter to the king declared, "the Parliament of this Kingdom was procured by the Duke, because he thought his plots would be most acceptable to the Puritans."[16] Throughout the parliament the effort was made to keep contact with the members. This fact could not be kept secret, and the Venetian ambassador significantly reported rumors of meetings between members and the prince at night.[17] Buckingham even went so far as insolently to demand a definite answer from the king on the Spanish marriage question on the grounds that he wished to "assure some of them [the commons members] . . . . underhand."[18] The duke also worked in concert with the popular lords, and one of the charges of the Spanish ambassadors was that "the Duke had reconciled himself to all the popular men of the State, and drawn them forth out of prisons, restraints, and confinements to alter the Government of the State at this Parliament, as Oxford, South-hampton, Say, and others whom he met at Suppers and Ordinaries to strengthen his popularity."[19]

---

[15] Ball, in Clarke, p. 502

[16] Cabala, Mysteries of State, in Letters of the Great Ministers of K. James and K. Charles (London: M.M.G. Bedell and T. Collins, 1654), p. 218.

[17] Cal.S.P., Venet., Vol. XVIII (1623-1625) (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1912), p. 301.

[18] Willson, p. 166, quoting Hardwicke State Papers, I, 466.

[19] Cabala, p. 91; Rushworth, I, 144.

Additional evidence that Buckingham was cultivating the Puritan lords comes from Clarendon who tells us that "when the duke of Buckingham proposed to himself, after his return with the prince from Spain, to make himself popular . . . . he resolved to embrace the friendship of the lord Say; who was as solicitous to climb by that ladder."[20] That the friendship was successful is indicated by the fact that Say was raised to a viscountcy in July, 1624, probably through Buckingham's influence.[21]

With these developments, the parliament gained immense strength, while James was left friendless, deserted by both Buckingham and Charles. Shortly after the session opened, the new aggressive spirit of the members was reflected in a petition that the king would decree a day of solemn fast and supplication.[22] After some delay, James acceded to the request, and Isaac Bargrave, the pastor of the nearby church of St. Margarets, Westminster, preached before the commons on the last day of the month.[23] In his later life, Bargrave showed himself to be a foe of Puritanism, but at this stage in his career he was evidently in sympathy with the popular party in parliament. There is some reason to think that he was instructed by Buckingham or at least that he made an effort to please the duke, for one of the three "enemies of innocency" which he singled out for denunciation in his sermon were the bribe-takers and pensioners to foreign states[24]--a remark which may be a somewhat transparent preparation for the duke's engineering of the impeachment of the Lord Treasurer Middlesex. The other two objects of his polemic were the Roman Catholics[25] and the high church party in the English church.[26] Catholicism, of course, was a traditional whipping-boy, but Bargrave's equally severe censure of the Anglo-Catholics was rather extraordinary. Calling them "halfe Papists, halfe Protestants," he heaped upon them the ridicule to which proponents of a *via media* are always open. "While they would be both Papists and Protestants," he declared, "they are indeede newters and nihils. Let all zealous soules set a brand vpon such Hermophrodite Christians, as these latter times haue discouered to vs."[27]

---

[20] Clarendon, III, 565.

[21] Cal. S.P., Dom., Jas. I, Vol. XI (1623-25) (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1859), p. 295.

[22] C.J., I, 671, 715.

[23] On March 1, Bargrave was voted thanks by the house (ibid., 675).

[24] Isaac Bargrave, A Sermon Preached before the Honorable Assembly; of Knights, Cittizens, and Burgesses, of the Lower House of Parliament: February the Last. 1623. (London: I. Bartlett and I. Spencer, 1624), p. 26.

With so promising a beginning to the session, the Puritans were evidently encouraged to introduce legislation into parliament designed to reform the more flagrant abuses of the Establishment. The house went to work on two very important bills, one against simony[28] and the other against scandalous ministers,[29] while at the same time, an attack was launched against the more obnoxious personalities of the high church party. A committee was established to receive petitions,[30] and threatening investigations were begun against Anyan, Montague, Harsnett, and other leaders of what might be called the ecclesiastical right-wing.[31] This work was continued right up to the end of the session, and just a few days before the king prorogued the assembly, the commons authorized two members, one of whom was the great leader, John Pym, to carry on an investigation of popish books which were alleged to be issuing from the press.[32]

---

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 22-25. [26] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

[27] *Ibid.* [28] *C.J.*, I, 684, 704.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 686, 699. [30] *Ibid.*, p. 695.

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 692, 695, 699, 701, 704, 707, 713.

Perhaps the best example of co-operation berween the duke and the Puritans in parliament was the petition against the Roman Catholics which the two houses drew up and presented to the king in April. The petition received enthusiastic Puritan support and may actually have been of Puritan inspiration since Preston played so prominent a part in its inception. Using his pulpit at Lincoln's Inn as a propaganda instrument, Preston preached sermons which "wrought much upon the Parliament, so that a bold petition was contrived and presented to the king at Whitehall."[33] Striking out against Catholic proselytism and influence, parliament demanded that the king "put the Laws in due Execution, which are made, and stand in force against the Popish Recusants."[34] It was the last item in the petition, however, that went to the heart of the matter. Having so lately been delivered from the general toleration of Roman Catholics that was scheduled to accompany the Spanish match, the parliament asked the king to give them his word "that upon no occasion of Marriage or Treaty, or other request in that behalf from any foreign Prince or States whatsoever" would he "take off, or slacken the Execution" of the recusancy laws.[35] Such presumptuous advice from the parliament was never welcome to James, and on this occasion he angrily denounced it as a "stinging Petition" in a letter to Secretary Conway.[36] Yet in spite of the king's opposition to the petition, Charles and Buckingham joined the house of lords in the approval of it, requesting only minor changes in the direction of moderation.[37]

---

[32] Ibid., p. 709.

[33] Ball, in Clarke, p. 502.

[34] Rushworth, I, 142. The petition was altered somewhat in the lords.

[35] Ibid., pp. 142-143. [36] Ibid., p. 140.

It was such co-operation as this, achieving results that were desired by both parties, that made the alliance take on new value in the eyes of both Buckingham and the Puritans. Just as Buckingham had come to embody the great hope of the Puritans for an early reformation of the church, so also Preston had become highly useful to Buckingham as a contact with a powerful parliamentary faction. That these ties had acquired an extraordinary strength in the few months since the prince's return from Spain was soon to be demonstrated in a crisis which threatened the entire existence of the alliance.

This crisis was occasioned by a dispute between Preston and a fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Paul Micklethwait,[38] and it would seem that the whole affair was deliberately fomented by the high church party in an attempt to force Buckingham to desert the alliance. Some time before, Preston had been presented to the lectureship at Trinity Church, Cambridge, but this preferment had been disputed by Micklethwait who had been able to secure the support of the vice-chancellor of the university, an officer who claimed a somewhat shadowy jurisdiction over the disposal of the position. Although the post was of no great importance, the dispute rapidly came to be regarded as a symbol of the whole ecclesiastical struggle in England. At first, the opposition to Preston had not been too formidable. Nicholas Felton, bishop of Ely, and Secretary Conway were evidently sympathetic,[39] and by August, 1624, Preston was sufficiently assured of success to write to Conway thanking him for his "patience and equanimity" in handling the dispute.[40] It would seem, however, that the high church party was bringing steadily increasing pressure to bear against the confirmation of Preston's appointment. Ball testifies from his own experience that he was bewildered at the perseverance with which Micklethwait struggled for so poor an advancement until he learned that "he was set upon by the Prelatical Heads, who told him that it was a service acceptable to the King, and he should be rewarded for it."[41] Thus, James, too, seems to have joined in the opposition to Preston's appointment, for although Secretary Conway informed the Bishop of Ely that the king had a good opinion of Preston,[42] Ball was convinced that the monarch was "against the Doctor's preaching in the University, the consequence whereof he well saw, and was informed fully of."[43]

---

[37] Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords Officially Taken by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliaments, A.D. 1624 and 1626, ed. Samuel Rawson Gardiner ("Camden Society Publications," New Series, XXIV [Westminster, 1879]), pp. 52-57, 62-64, 99-101.

[38] I have adopted the spelling which Micklethwait apparently used on his own petition to Secretary Conway (Cal.S.P., Dom., Jas. I, Vol. XI [1623-25], p. 236). Ball refers to him throughout as Middlethwite.

Unlike James, Buckingham supported Preston throughout the struggle. The controversy was doubtless somewhat embarrassing for the duke since at the same time he was patronizing the high churchmen and was retaining Laud as his chaplain. As a consequence, he seems to have made every effort to settle the conflict without alienating either of the parties, and even went so far as to offer Preston the vacant bishopric of Gloucester on the condition that he would withdraw his candidacy.[44] In the end, a conference was held before the king at Royston at which Preston was urged to give over so trifling an appointment. Preston proved adamant, however, and was able to make good his resistance for "the Duke had taken care that nothing should be ordered and concluded against the Doctor's mind, for the Duke resolved not to lose him, so the meeting was dissolved and nothing done."[45]

---

[39] Cal.S.P., Dom., Jas. I, Vol. XI (1623-25), pp. 236, 312-313, 321.

[40] Ibid., p. 321. [41] Ball, in Clarke, p. 500.

[42] Cal.S.P., Dom., Jas. I, Vol. XI (1623-25), p. 236.

[43] Ball, in Clarke, p. 500.

[44] Ibid. The bishopric of Gloucester was vacant from October 20, 1624, to March 6, 1625 (F.M. Powicke [ed.], Handbook of British Chronology [London: Royal Historical Society, 1939], p. 149).

Despite this settlement, James did not yield without a final effort, and in the evening Preston was invited to supper by Secretary Conway. The story goes that when the meal was concluded, Conway announced that the king had ordered him to offer Preston his choice of any other preferment. If indeed so tempting an offer was made to Preston, it failed utterly, for Preston was soon confirmed in the Trinity lectureship.[46] With this confirmation, the alliance had withstood serious attack. That it had been able to do so can only be ascribed to the fact that Buckingham felt that he could not do without Preston's support. Ball, astute as ever, pointed up this fact in the course of analyzing the motives of the major characters in the controversy. "The Doctors end," he declared, "was to do good, not to get good; the Kings was to make him uselesse, and divide him from the Puritans; the Duke was more indifferent, who laboured in him to win and gratifie the Puritans, whose power in Parliament was now grown very formidable."[47] Nevertheless, the controversy had put a severe strain on the alliance and the divided loyalties which the duke had displayed must, to some extent, have cooled the friendship.

The opposition evoked by Preston's appointment to the Trinity lectureship was eloquent testimony that the high churchmen were now becoming aroused. The fact that they had failed to make good their objections must have greatly added to their alarm, and one suspects that Buckingham's chaplain spent some sleepless nights over his master's aberration.[48] Furthermore, gossip had it that the prince himself was becoming attached to the Puritan faction, and in June, the French ambassador, Tillières, had notified his government that Charles was surrounded by Puritans, and would soon be a Puritan himself.[49]

---

[45] Ball, in Clarke, p. 500.

[46] *Ibid*. [47] *Ibid*.

Indeed, the high church party had good reason to be alarmed, for Preston's relations with Buckingham were now so close that he was able to press the duke to adopt what can only be described as an aggressively pro-Puritan policy. Taking advantage of the duke's difficulties, Preston argued for a scheme which by a happy accident would satisfy the aspirations of both the favorite and the Puritans. Had it been carried out, the scheme undoubtedly would have struck a major blow at the old church and, in all likelihood, severed the traditional Stuart alliance between the monarchy and the hierarchy. Despite the fact that the whole endeavor fell to the ground, the period during which it was under discussion constitutes the high-water mark of the Puritan-Buckingham alliance.

That the scheme is known to us at all is due to the Boswellian devotion of John Hacket, then chaplain to and later biographer of the Lord Keeper Williams. Evidently the entire affair was a carefully guarded secret, for the records of the current gossip and the contemporary newsletters are utterly devoid of any mention of it. Even Ball was either entirely ignorant of the story or for good reason thought it wise to suppress it. Yet despite the absence of confirmation from any other source, Hacket's description of how he came by his information is so ingenuous that it cannot but be credited. After pointing out that there was no evidence of the affair anywhere in writing, Hacket wrote, "But the Relation of the Lord Keeper to him that heard it of him, when it was fresh and in motion, hath been preserved in the Desk, and comes forth now to publick Knowledge."[50]

---

[48] Note the alarmed tone of one high churchman: "My Lord of S. David's must nowe and in such cases putt for the Church with the Duke, and use his greate creditt, that we be not swallowed up with a Puritan Bishopriqry" (Correspondence of John Cosin, p. 22).

[49] Gardiner, V, 251, citing Harleian MSS, 4594, fol. 59. For the suspected Puritanism of Charles, see also Gardiner, III, 241, n.2.

For some time Buckingham had been seriously embarrassed by the difficulty of reconciling a pro-parliament policy with his sponsorship of the unpopular French marriage for the prince--especially so since that marriage was suspected to imply the relaxation of the penal laws against the Catholics. Facing a rising tide of distrust, the duke and his advisers came to the conclusion that the situation could be saved only by an appeal to patriotism in a glorious war or by some signal gesture calculated to win the friendship of the parliament. It was while he was in the throes of this dilemma that Preston--"a good Crow to smell Carion"--approached the duke with an ingenious plan to solve all difficulties by the dissolution of the cathedral churches with their deans and chapters. Since the plundering of the church was an old and respected Tudor policy, Preston's plan can hardly be called original, but it was undoubtedly shrewd in that it was a perfect response to the duke's needs while at the same time it considerably advanced the Puritan program. Assuring Buckingham that such an alteration in the ecclesiastical constitution would bring him the love of the people, Preston outlined at some length the program which he desired the duke to follow. In it, he urged the duke to

---

[50] John Hacket, Scrinia Reserata: A Memorial Offer'd to the Great Deservings of John Williams, D.D., Who Some Time Held the Places of L^{d} Keeper of the Great Seal of England, L^{d} Bishop of Lincoln, and L^{d} Archbishop of York (London: Samuel Lowndes, 1693), Part I, p. 203. Hacket was apparently sure that he was the only one who knew of the incident: "There is no Script of it remaining in the Cabal, nor in any other Pamphlet, that I have read. It was a Mischief not better prevented, than concealed from the World, that it was prevented."

> become a warm and zealous Christian, that would employ his best help strenuously to lop off from this half-reformed Church, the superstitious Branches of Romish Superstition, that much disfigured it. Then he named the Quire-Service of Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, with Appennages, which were maintained with vast Wealth, and Lands of excessive Commodity, to feed fat, lazy, and unprofitable Drones. And yet all that Chanting and Pomp hindered the Heavenly Power, and Simplicity of Prayer: And furthered not the Preaching of the Gospel. And now, says he, let your Grace observe all the ensuing Emoluments, if you will lean to this Counsel, God's Glory shall be better set forth . . . . . The Lands of those Chapters escheating to the Crown, by the Dissolution of their Foundations, will pay the King's Debts . . . . . Lastly, Your Grace shall not only surmount Envy, but turn the Darling of the Commonwealth, and be reverenced by the best Operators in Parliament, as a Father of a Family.[51]

When Preston had finished, Buckingham evidently did not commit himself, but he thanked the minister, assured him of his interest, and asked him to return that the project might be discussed at greater length--an invitation, as Hacket informs us, which Preston accepted to the extent of at least three visits a week. It does not seem possible that Buckingham could ever have induced either James or Charles to sanction such an act, but he evidently manifested enough interest to arouse the Lord Keeper Williams from a sickbed to go to the defense of the church. At first, Williams's efforts were entirely without success. An attempt to see Buckingham was frustrated when the duke was closeted with Preston and refused to see him. An interview with Preston failed utterly when Williams, misunderstanding the man with whom he had to deal, sought to win him over with the bribe of the deanery of Westminster. Finally, however, Williams was able to secure an audience with Buckingham. Shrewdly dwelling on the weak point in Buckingham's alliance with the Puritans, the Lord Keeper rested his argument on the tendency of the Puritans to accept favors without adequately repaying them. "That Generation of male-contents, to whose Love an Evil Counsellor woed him," he told the duke, "was ever false and untrusty; not suspected, but known, ever since the Faction was first rock'd in the Cradle, to be tied by no Benefits: Importunate Suitors, and ever craving: And having sped, think their Cause, and their deservings have paid Thanks sufficient to their Patron."[52]

---

[51] _Ibid_., p. 204.

Then taking the offensive, Williams threatened Buckingham that if he persisted in this unholy scheme, his enemies in parliament would increase rather than decrease. Probably relying on Preston's assurances and on his own knowledge of the Puritan complexion of the house of commons, the duke was frankly sceptical of this suggestion, telling the worried churchman, "I know not how you Bishops may struggle, but I am much deluded if a great part of the Knights and Burgesses would not be glad to see this Alteration."[53] To this challenge Williams was able to produce a list of members who he conceived would be loyal to the Establishment, but in the end Buckingham cut his recital short with the statement, "Nay, you are come to me, my Lord, in a lucky Hour. I was never further than an Equipoise about this Project; Now I have done with it."[54]

The astonishing thing about the whole affair is that Buckingham would allow himself to be carried as far as an "Equipoise" about it. As Williams had indicated, Buckingham certainly could not have hoped to command the allegiance of the Puritans for long, especially if he had continued to exercise his blundering statecraft and disastrous military leadership. And in exchange, he surely would have alienated the Anglo-Catholic wing, the only group in the nation that consistently supported him throughout his erratic career. It must have been considerations of this character rather than any parliamentary opposition which the Lord Keeper could muster that induced Buckingham to give over the scheme. Whatever were the reasons which motivated him, however, it is certain that when the duke abandoned the project the Puritan-Buckingham alliance began on its down-grade, and the two parties never again approached the same degree of close rapport.

---

[52] Ibid., p. 205. [53] Ibid. [54] Ibid., p. 206.

Indeed, the seeds of disunion which had remained sterile throughout the preceding period were already beginning to sprout as the reign neared its close. Certainly, the Puritans, while reaping much advantage from the alliance, had been disappointed in Buckingham's failure to support any fundamental alteration in the church, while they must have been equally irritated by his encouragement to the high church party at the same time that he was posing as protector of the Puritans. The latent animosities created by this behavior first came into the open during the negotiations between France and England over the marriage of Charles to Henrietta Maria. Preston, like his colleagues in the Puritan party, was deeply opposed to the match, and this attitude was strengthened by his knowledge of England's undertaking to supply a number of ships to France to be used against the Huguenots of La Rochelle. This treaty did much to destroy the amity between Buckingham and his protégé, and Ball tells us that "from that time Doctor Preston doubted of the Saint-ship of the Duke of Buckingham, whom otherwise he honoured and loved very much."[55]

Preston, moreover, did not confine his displeasure to complaints to Buckingham but boldly voiced his opinions in a sermon before James. After warning against the danger of mingling religions, Preston concluded his address with a long section on the obligations of a sovereign toward the church.[56] "It is the flocke of God," he told the king, "and its no disparagement for Kings to be his shepherds as David was, if Wolves therefore doe enter through their negligence, and snatch up, now a sheepe, and then a Lambe, the Lord will one day require it at their hands."[57] Perhaps most pointed of all was his recital of the list of Biblical kings who forsook the Lord and had cause to regret it--a list, of course, which included a Solomon won to infidelity by the wiles of his wicked wives.[58] At the same time, the upright Asa was commended for having "removed Maacah his Mother from being Queene, because she had made an Idoll in a grove."[59]

---

[55] Ball, in Clarke, p. 502.

This sort of outspokenness was likely to commend itself to neither James nor Buckingham. Yet in spite of the frictions raised on both sides, no effort was made to dissolve the alliance. On the contrary, both parties seem to have retained high hopes of what the combination might produce. Declining in popularity, Buckingham clung to Preston as a last tie with the mass of the English people, while the Puritans looked forward to the new reign with much the same anticipation as their predecessors had awaited the accession of James. Thus, though major differences might divide the two parties, the alliance was evidently of sufficient value to induce both to desire its continuation for the present. It yet remained to be seen whether the new reign would exalt the alliance to new heights or preside over its dissolution.

---

[56] John Preston, "The Pillar and Grovnd of Trvth," Sermons Preached before His Maiestie, and upon Other Speciall Occasions (London: A. Boler, 1637), pp. 20-26.

[57] Ibid., p. 22. [58] Ibid., p. 23. [59] Ibid., p. 24.

II

The history of the Puritan alliance with Buckingham after the death of James is largely one of gradual but steady decline, marked by occasional attempts at revival. That this should be the case after a period of such remarkable success was due to the growing discovery of the utter impossibility of reconciling two such extremely divergent viewpoints. But more important than the cause of the decline was its result, for the failure of the alliance drove the Puritans back into their former reliance upon the parliament. Even during the period of closest co-operation with the duke, of course, the Puritans had not ceased to look to the parliament as their champion. Indeed, it was precisely because of their influence in that assembly that their friendship had been so eagerly sought by Buckingham. Nevertheless, when the Puritans disengaged themselves from their alliance with the duke and once more joined the opposition, the last opportunity had passed for the realization of the traditional Puritan predilection for a reformation imposed from above. Within a year of the old king's death, it was irrevocably determined that the Puritans and the crown were to be arrayed on opposite sides in the great struggle which had already begun.

Such antagonism was not yet the case, however, when Charles succeeded to the throne in March, 1625. On the contrary, many of the irritations which had been undermining the alliance were for the moment swept away in a burst of enthusiasm for the new sovereign. As yet, little was known about the new monarch, and most of what was known was good. Though the nation might look with some disfavor on the French betrothal and suffer some apprehension about a Catholic toleration, it might derive comfort from the assurances made by the new king in the last parliament that if he married a Catholic lady, he would not marry her religion. Moreover, it was widely known that Charles had joined with Buckingham in the latter's pro-parliament policy after the return from Spain and had even to some small extent been identified with the Puritans.

Though this picture was doubtless somewhat deceptive, nothing happened during the first few months of the reign to destroy the illusion. When James died, Preston attended on Charles and Buckingham, and all three of them hastened to Whitehall in "Coaches shut down."[60] There were high hopes that the new reign would usher in a Puritan era, and Ball remarks that "the Bishops generally, and Doctor Prestons enemies, and all that had contended with the Duke were Crestfallen."[61] Indeed, Preston's great opponent, Bishop Williams, was known to be under the royal disfavor and was soon to lose his post as Lord Keeper.

Yet despite these promising signs, the disintegration of the alliance seems already to have set in. For one thing, the accession of Charles had brought new responsibilities to both the king and Buckingham and from the new position their friends of the previous reign appeared far less attractive. From the vantage-point of authority, Charles perceived the necessity of defending the allies of the crown in the Establishment, and to an unquestioning belief in his father's dictum of "no bishop, no king" he added a natural inclination toward the high church view. Moreover, his word--if it meant anything--was pledged in the marriage treaty to the protection of the Catholics, and even Charles must have seen that he could not hope to fulfill his French commitments and at the same time attract Puritan support. The transition to this outlook, so fortunate for the Anglo-Catholics, must have been encouraged in every way possible, for the conservative element in the church was now thoroughly alarmed. Montague wrote to the bishop of Durham that the "plott" was strong against them,[62] and Laud, as the protégé of the duke, might be expected to do everything in his power to combat the influence of his rival.

---

[60] Ball, in Clarke, p. 503. [61] Ibid.

For the first few months, however, the Puritans were enjoying a brief moment of illusory triumph and so continued in harmony with the crown. Perhaps because of the encouraging favorableness of their new position--perhaps also because of the disquieting rumors that the government might revert to its old hostility--the Puritans seem to have determined to bring parliamentary pressure to bear on the king and his favorite. Whatever the causes may have been which lay behind its introduction, a markedly Puritan report on religion, which was to be the basis of legislation or of a petition to the king, was submitted to the house by a subcommittee headed by John Pym and Sir Edwin Sandys. Primarily directed against the danger from the Roman Catholics, the articles unequivocally repudiated any idea of toleration on the grounds that "if they gayne but a connivencye, they will presse for a tolleration, then strive for an equallitye, and lastly aspire to such a superioritye as may worke the extermination both of us and our religion."[63] As remedies against "this contageous and dangerous desease," the commons recommended a simple program: first, the strengthening of a militant Protestantism, and second, the enfeeblement of Catholicism.[64] It is with the first principle that we are primarily interested, for this remedy called for a sharp turn in the direction of Puritanism. The schools of the realm were to be protected against popery, the schoolmasters being

---

[62] Correspondence of John Cosin, pp. 78-79.

[63] Debates in 1625, p. 19.

[64] Ibid., pp. 22-25.

"injoyned to catechise and instruct their schollers in the groundes and principles of trew religion," or else suffer removal. The pulpit, too, was to be re-enforced. For one thing, the king was requested to advise the bishops to take the important step of restoring "such learned and painefull Ministers to the libertye of preachinge the word of God and catechisinge of children as have bene formerly silenced," the only provision being that the ministers conform to the rites and ceremonies "by law establisht." At the same time, all the evils of non-residence, pluralities, and commendams were sharply denounced as "great hinderances to the instructinge of the people in the trew knowledge and service of God," and some effort was made to find a way to better the situation. It is an interesting commentary on the economic constitution of the parliament that, though provision was made in the report for an increase in the notoriously insufficient maintenance of some livings, the measure was dropped in the final draft.[65].

On July 8, a petition embodying this report with only minor alterations was presented to Charles at Hampton Court.[66] Although the king received the petition graciously and promised a full reply shortly, he also disquieted the commons by asking for the release of Richard Montague, the Anglo-Catholic writer then under examination by the house.[67] As time passed, the petty discord struck thus early in the reign was expanded to such an extent that it threatened to break down the whole structure of harmonious understandings which had been built up in the previous months. As far as religion was concerned, it was becoming increasingly evident that if the government could be induced to follow a Puritan policy, it would do so only with the greatest reluctance. At the same time, there were growing indications that favors were to be granted to the Roman Catholics, while the king's attitude in the Montague affair left no room for doubt that the royal sympathy lay with the high churchmen.

---

[65] Ibid., pp. 20-22; Rushworth, I, 182-183.

[66] Debates in 1625, p. 61.

[67] Ibid., pp. 61-62.

By August, when the second session met at Oxford, the trend was becoming so evident that a number of the leading members took it upon themselves to make some sort of attempt to save the alliance. On August 6 and 7, perhaps after a discussion with Buckingham, a group of these men arose one after the other to outline for the house a program by which the popular party and the government could be reconciled. Finally, the whole discussion was summed up by Sir Nathaniel Rich in five propositions. These were that first, the king should deliver an answer to the petition on religion; second, the king should enlighten the parliament on the nature of the war; third, the whole council rather than simply Buckingham should be consulted; fourth, the necessities of the king's revenue should be investigated; and lastly, the problem of impositions should be settled.[68]

The program thus outlined was urged upon the duke not only in parliament but in private as well. It seems that Puritan members had several conferences with Buckingham at which the strongest pressure and the most persuasive arguments were used to induce the duke to accept Rich's proposals. The observant Williams was fully aware of these facts, and two days after the session ended he wrote to Charles that Sir John Eliot, Lord Say and Sele, Sir William Stroud, and Sir Nathaniel Rich "were never out of my Lord-Duke's Chamber, and Bosom."[69] Later on, Eliot himself wrote his own version of the negotiations in his Negotium Posterorum. The advice which the duke received, Eliot declared,

---

[68] Ibid., pp. 90-91; C.J., I, 811-812. See also the treatments of Gardiner, V, 412-415; Willson, pp. 178-179.

[69] Hacket, Part II, pp. 17-18.

> was much to indeavor an accomodation wth the parliament. the errors most insisted on, were said to be excusable, if retracted; . . . . the greatest difficultie was conceav'd to rest in religion, & the ffleet. for the first, the ielosie being deriv'd from his protection given to Montague; . . . . & yett in both, that there might be a reconciliation for himself.[70]

At first, these consultations promised some success, but in the end Buckingham declared himself willing to make concessions only in the matter of religion. As Eliot put it, "These & the like counsells were presented to the D[uke] w^{ch} wrought an inclination for the instant that gave his frinds some hope: but those that were about him gave it an alteration in the cabinet." Although he repudiated the advice of his Puritan friends for a general accommodation, Buckingham with his usual optimism vainly attempted to satisfy them with a favorable answer to the petition on religion, and in a message shortly before the dissolution of parliament, the king acceded to almost every one of their demands.[72] Even this action, however, failed to impress the Puritans, for many could read between the lines and discern that the trend which official policy was taking was not in the long run favorable to the Puritan cause. Christopher Sherland, one of the most prominent of the lay leaders of Puritanism, was probably articulating the apprehension and dissatisfaction of the whole party when he rose in the house on the last day of the sitting and expressed his doubts about the petition. "Who knoweth what wilbe th'execution of it?" he queried, "naye, have wee not cause to feare the worst?"[73]

This uneasiness was soon amply substantiated by the victory of the French fleet over the Huguenot leader Soubise, in September,

---

[70] Eliot, II, 53. [71] Ibid., p. 54.

[72] C.J., I, 813. [73] Debates in 1625, p. 149.

1625--a victory that was aided by the loan to the French of eight English ships. Accustomed to identifying themselves with the Reformed churches on the Continent and obsessed with fear of the Roman Catholics, the Puritans saw this defeat and the events which followed from it as a preview of what might well happen in England. Like all Puritans, Preston was greatly upset at the results of this pro-French policy, although he evidently was persuaded that the duke had been over-ruled to lend the ships against his own inclination.[74] This distress he characteristically expressed sometime during the La Rochelle troubles in a forceful sermon before the king in which he urged Charles to inaugurate a pro-Protestant foreign policy by giving aid to the Reformed churches abroad in their struggle against the Catholic menace. Basing his appeal on the rather pragmatic consideration that "what measure we mete to others, in their distresse, men shall measure the same to us in our necessitie,"[75] Preston developed his arguments with steadily increasing tempo until he reached the climax in a somewhat intimidating pronouncement. "If any do not doe their best," he told the court, "I pronounce this in the Name of the most true God, that shall make it good sooner or later, they and their houses shal perish, and be as the straw . . . . that oppresseth the coale of fire."[76]

Incidents like this plainly indicated that the government and the Puritans were divided by fundamental differences of outlook. Because of these differences, it was now apparent that the alliance with Buckingham was in sharp decline, but before it took its final plunge downward, it enjoyed a brief period of revival. This time the initiative came from Buckingham. To a certain extent, he seems to have been dismayed by the coolness which descended on the alliance after his repudiation of the counsel of the parliament men. Toward the end of the last session the duke had been severely censured, and though the Puritans do not seem to have been his attackers, it is not unlikely that they regarded the attack with some equanimity if not satisfaction. Ball tells us that those whom Preston controlled were neutral, but it is certain that Buckingham was sufficiently intimidated by this show of parliamentary opposition to make efforts to improve his strength. By disgracing Williams and compromising with Pembroke, Buckingham was able to enfeeble the opposition in the house of lords;[77] by renewing the lost vigor of the alliance with the Puritans, he sought to make his position invincible. As early as August he utilized the aid of the Puritan leaders in parliament in getting rid of the Lord Keeper. It was with good reason that Williams complained to Charles that his principal attackers were the duke's Puritan friends: "Sir John Eliot, the only Member that began to thrust in a Complaint against me: the Lord Viscount Saye, who took upon him to name Sir Thomas Crew to succeed in my Place: Sir William Stroud, and Sir Nathanael Rich, whom my Friends most noted to malice me."[78]

---

[74] Ball, in Clarke, p. 504.

[75] John Preston, "The New Life," Sermons Preached before His Maiestie, p. 48.

[76] Ibid., p. 52.

In spite of this additional instance of successful cooperation, the duke made his usual sanguine mistake of imagining that a few minor concessions would serve to satisfy the Puritans, for the services which he performed for them were all of second-rate importance. For one thing, official aid was given to Emmanuel

---

[77] See Gardiner, VI, 29-32.

[78] Hacket, Part II, p. 18.

College in obtaining the successful termination of a law-suit which for some time had languished in the unsympathetic hands of Williams.[79] Moreover, the king, in an attempt to pose as the champion of Protestantism, had sent out various anti-Catholic proclamations.[80] Despite the comparative insignificance of these concessions, it is likely that Buckingham's efforts to revive the alliance were sincere, for he was certainly working in concert with the Puritan leaders in parliament and was even reputed to have nominated Preston to succeed Bishop Williams as Lord Keeper![81]

This renaissance of the alliance, however, was of but short duration, for nothing could halt the antipathies which were now dividing all England. It was no doubt true that both Preston and Buckingham would have preferred to have continued the association for, as Ball remarks, they both "loved for to temporise and wait upon events,"[82] but neither the high church party nor the Puritans were content with this arrangement and both soon tried to force the issue. On the one hand, the duke was subjected to heavy pressure from the hierarchy who employed somewhat the same arguments as had Williams in the previous reign. Pointing out that the Puritans had given the duke no help during the last parliament at Oxford, they demanded to know what principle of politics could justify the patronage of men that would not or could not deliver anything in return. Indeed, they were sceptical of the success of any _rapprochement_ with the Puritan leaders, for they bade Buckingham "consider whether Puritans were like to be his friends whose ways were _toto_ _coelo_ different."[83] Then, in order to drive their point home, they delivered something very like an ultimatum to the duke, telling him that "he could not have them both, if he adhered to those that sought their ruine, they must adhere to such as would support them."[84]

---

[79] Ball, in Clarke, p. 498.

[80] Gardiner, VI, 32-33.

[81] Ball, in Clarke, p. 505.

[82] _Ibid_. [83] _Ibid_.

Paralleling the bishops' demands on Buckingham, certain elements within the Puritan ranks were urging Preston to desert the duke if he would not give over his encouragement to the "rotten and corrupted Clergy."[85] Thus, though worlds apart, the two parties were united in the demand that Buckingham be forced to cease his vacillation and declare once and for all where his sympathies lay. Though both Preston and the duke tried to avoid it, the inevitable crisis came when the two influential Puritan lords, Warwick and Say, arranged for a conference at York House to judge on the orthodoxy of the books of Richard Montague.[86] Preston had long interested himself in the subject, and shortly after Charles's first parliament he had been asked to study the matter by Buckingham and had gone off to the West to consult the Bishop of Salisbury and Henry Sherfield, one of the most important of the Puritan leaders in the commons.[87] Thus, it was only natural that Preston was expected to be one of the two disputants to attack Montague's Anglo-Catholicism, but in an endeavor to prevent his participation the duke sent a message advising him to stay away. At first, Preston was inclined to agree with Buckingham and resolved not to attend. Despite this resolution, he became apprehensive of a high church victory and, as a consequence, joined the conferees shortly after the meeting had opened.[88] Though he still intended to remain merely an auditor in the dispute, he was drawn into the discussion by Viscount Say and was soon taking full part in the arguments.[89]

---

[84] Ibid. [85] Ibid.

[86] For detailed accounts of the conference, see Ball, in Clarke, pp. 505-511; "The Sum and Substance of the Conferences Lately Had at York House Concerning Mr. Montague's Books, Which It Pleased the Duke of Buckingham to Appoint, and with Divers Other Honourable Persons to Hear, at the Special and Earnest Request of the Earl of Warwick and the Lord Say," The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843-1855), II, 17-81.

[87] Ball, in Clarke, p. 504.

With this event, Preston definitely showed that the Puritan party would hang together in its opposition to the duke. By now the alliance was irreparably damaged and the destruction was to be completed at the second conference held a week later on February 17. Between the two meetings Preston, as Ball tells us, was "informed that there had been a meeting at the Countesse of Denbies, and the Duke had promised to leave him," and fortified with this information, he entered the second controversy without restraint.[90] The result of these actions was the cessation of any vestige of co-operation which may have remained between the Puritans and Buckingham. Thus the duke received no help from Preston in his campaign for election to the chancellorship of Cambridge, and Preston soon became convinced that Buckingham had determined to ruin him.[91]

If all Puritan relations with Buckingham were not now completely dead, they were shortly given the coup de grâce by Preston himself. It seems that Preston postponed joining the opposition to his former patron until the last possible moment, but in the end he determined to take action. In the preceding parliament, Preston's friends had refrained from supporting the attack on the duke, but in 1626 all obligations which Preston may have felt had been dissolved. Ball records how in writing to a Puritan commons member from Northamptonshire, Preston "discovers all, shews him the hopeless posture of the Duke, how much they both were disappointed in him, lays some directions what to do and urgeth activnesse."[92] Ball's description of Preston's correspondent as "a Gentleman of very able parts, and clear affections to the publike good, no stranger to the Court in former times, nor to the Duke of Buckingham, with whom the Doctor used to communicate affairs, and who was then a Parliament man of much esteem"[93] does not seem to fit well any of the Northamptonshire members in 1626.[94] The member most likely to have been the addresse was Christopher Sherland, who as a great lay leader of Puritanism might well have been involved in the alliance with Buckingham, while his close relation with the Yelvertons might have connected him in some manner with the court.[95] Regardless of for whom the letter was meant, it never found its way to its destination. Lost by its carrier somewhere around the Temple Bar, the letter eventually came into the hands of Buckingham. As a result of this, the duke became extremely bitter toward Preston and resolved to "break" him,[96] although his sense of betrayal was in large measure unjustified since he had already asked Laud for the notorious "O. and P. list" which deliberately excluded Puritans from advancement in the church.[97] At any rate, Buckingham was able to carry out his revenge only to a very limited extent.[98]

---

[88] Ibid., p. 506. [89] Works of John Cosin, II, 59.

[90] Ball, in Clarke, p. 506. [91] Ibid., p. 512.

---

[92] Ibid., p. 514.

[93] Ibid.

[94] The members of the commons from Northamptonshire in the parliament of 1626 were as follows: Sir William Spencer, Sir John Pickeringe, Sir John Hobart, John Crewe, Sir Thomas Dacres, Sir George Sandes, Christopher Sherland, Richard Spencer, Mildmay Lord Burghersh, and Lawrence Whitacre (Members of Parliament, I, 470).

[95] The fact that Sherland was the grandson and nephew of the two Yelvertons is revealed in his funeral sermon preached by Sibbes (Works of Richard Sibbes, I, 347).

[96] Ball, in Clarke, pp. 514-515.

Preston's action in joining the opposition was a symbol of the fact that future Puritan history was to be concerned with the parliament rather than with the crown. Even during the height of the Puritan-Buckingham alliance, it is probable that there were many Puritans who did not share Preston's belief that a reformation could be realized through combination with the duke. Preston did not own the party; neither was Puritan organization so tight that adherence to the party line could be enforced.[99] Especially was this evident during the last phase, when, as we have seen, elements within the party successfully over-ruled Preston's disinclination for forcing the issue and insisted on the York House conference.

Despite these qualifications, it cannot be denied that the alliance with Buckingham is a most important chapter in Puritan history. That a considerable section of the Puritan party was involved is plainly indicated by all the contemporary sources, and Buckingham though capable of remarkable blunders, was not likely to support a prominent Puritan without expecting a proportionate measure of favors in return--favors which only the party could grant. Furthermore, it seems likely that other members of the party were joined with Preston in representing the movement to Buckingham, for the Puritan parliament men were certainly in communion with him, and we are definitely told that the Northamptonshire commons member to whom Preston wrote was formerly familiar with the duke but had since become disappointed in him. Certainly the advantages which Preston was able to secure must have raised the hopes of many Puritans and led them to support the alliance in the expectation of a reformation through royal initiative.[100]

---

[97] The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D. Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847-1860), III, 159.

[98] Buckingham was able to raise difficulties for Preston in connection with his Cambridge post (Ball, in Clarke, p. 517).

[99] Fuller's comment is significant: "The party called Puritan then being most active in Parliament, and doctor Preston most powerful with them, the duke rather used than loved him, to work that party to his compliance. Some thought the doctor was unwilling to do it; and no wonder he effected not, what he affected not. Others thought he was unable, that party being so diffusive, and then, in their designs (as since in their practices) divided" (Fuller, Worthies, II, 517).

Whatever benefits the Puritans derived from the alliance, the crown stood to gain more. Making timely concessions in the direction of low church Anglicanism, the government could have used an understanding with the Puritans as a link with those sections of the population from which the opposition was largely recruited. At least one man--and he one of the greatest statesmen which the age produced--saw in the alliance a possibility of strengthening the government through a more or less permanent combination between the crown and the Puritans. Writing to Buckingham early in 1624, the disgraced Francis Bacon gave the favorite some sound advice. "Let me advise you," he declared, "that the name of Puritans, in a Papist's mouth, do not make you to withdraw your favour . . . . . For of this kind is the greatest part of the body of the subjects, and besides (which is not to be forgotten), it is safest for the King and his service, that such men have their dependence upon Your Grace (who are intirely the King's) rather than upon any other subject."[101]

---

[100] There are hints that other Puritan ministers were connected with Buckingham. Samuel Ward declared, "I know my heart ever wished all honour and happiness unto him and therefore my tongue could never let fall the least irrespecting word" (Cal.S. P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. IX [1635-36] [London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866], pp. xxxiii-xxxv), and Stephen Marshall may have pressed the duke to obtain a promotion for him (The Godly Man's Legacy to the Saints upon Earth, Exhibited in the Life of That Great and Able Divine, and Painful Labourer in the Word, Mr. Stephen Marshal, Sometime Minister of the Gospel at Finchingfield in Essex [London, 1680], p. 10).

Unfortunately, it was Buckingham and not Bacon who was the king's principal adviser. To Buckingham, the alliance always seems to have been a temporary flirtation which could be discarded after it had served its purpose. At no time does he seem to have conceived of it as a policy to be consistently adhered to. With characteristic optimism, he imagined that he could hold the Puritans while at the same time pursuing policies to which they were unalterably opposed. It was only a short time until his actions convinced the Puritans that Buckingham was a pawn of the Catholic powers abroad and a mainstay of high church Anglicanism at home. With the development of this attitude, all hope of binding the Puritans to the throne had passed.

Indeed, it is questionable if it was not already too late when the alliance was first projected. Puritanism was becoming widely distributed among the commercial, landed, and legal sections of the populations, that is, among those classes which were most articulate in denouncing the abuses of Stuart absolutism. Because of this fact, Puritanism was in large measure becoming bound to the opposition through a series of powerful interlocking interests, and it is doubtful if the crown could have retained the Puritan allegiance without satisfying the entire catalogue of other grievances as well. Throughout its history Puritanism had found its most effective political expression in the parliament, and by 1623 it was in a very real sense committed to the struggle which that assembly had begun with the crown.

---

[101] Spedding, VII, 448-449.

CHAPTER V

THE LONG NIGHT AND THE DAWN:

1629-1640

English Puritans during the decade between 1629 and 1640 experienced their deepest despair and brightest hopefulness. It was a period when Charles, infuriated by the opposition which his policies evoked, endeavored to carry out his conception of good monarchical government free from all parliamentary obstructions. In religion, this meant the advancement of Laudian churchmanship and the severe repression of Puritanism--a desperate attempt by the king, as the Venetian agent said, to keep the poison of Puritanism "far from his heart and to pull out its roots."[1] For a time he was apparently successful, but at bottom discontent, ever aggravated by new grievances, was assuming dangerous proportions. At last with the uprising in Edinburgh in 1638, the tide began to turn, and ever more clearly the Puritans saw that the opportunity for a religious reformation was rapidly approaching.

I

During the years between 1629 and 1632 the organized campaign for a Puritan reformation entered into backruptcy. This collapse was primarily the result of two severe blows. The first was the loss of the parliamentary advocate. Early in the history of the movement, Puritans had been led to center all their hopes in the expectation that a sympathetic parliament would eventually be able to override royal opposition. With Charles's angry dissolution of parliament in 1629 and his resolve never again to call so factious a body, that hope seemed doomed to permanent burial. According to Sir Ferdinando Gorges, the dissolution "tooke all hope of Reformation of Church-government from many not affecting Episcopal Jurisdiction" and caused many to be "fearfull what would follow so unaccustomed an action."[2] The apprehension and despair which this blow caused weighed heavily on Puritan minds, but for a short time this pessimism must have been somewhat mitigated by the hopes centering in the board of feoffees of impropriations. Yet despite the fact that this project, in many ways the most ambitious of all Puritan schemes, was brilliantly conceived and well managed, it was eventually detected and suppressed in 1633. With this double tragedy, all Puritan hope of an imminent reformation was frustrated, and Puritan party organization seems to have very generally dissolved.

---

[1] Cal.S.P., Venet., Vol. XXIV (1636-39)(London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1923), p. 242.

This second blow--the suppression of the feoffees--requires fuller explanation.[3] The idea on which the project was based was very simple. In the course of centuries and especially since the Reformation, a great many English parish churches had become impropriated to private laymen. That is to say, the legal title to the income attached to the parish had been acquired by some layman who would usually allow only a miserable stipend out of it for the support of a clergyman. About 1625 the Puritans developed a plan to exploit this situation to the advancement of the movement. It was determined that money should be collected from wealthy Puritans and then used to buy up impropriations throughout the land. Then with the income derived from these investments, a considerable number of Puritan lecturers could be supported in those places where they would do the most good. Since these lecturers would not be beneficed, they could escape to a large extent the dangers of episcopal oversight, and thus a sort of unofficial Puritan ministry could be extended throughout England.

---

[2] Miller, p. 143, quoting Sir Ferdinando Gorges, "Briefe Narration," J. P. Baxter, Sir Ferdinando Gorges and His Province of Maine, II, 58-59.

[3] For much of this description of the feoffees of impropriations, I am indebted to Kirby, JMH, XIV (1942), 1-25.

To carry out this plan, a board of feoffees of impropriations was set up in London. Though Peter Heylyn implied that John Preston was the key figure behind the scheme,[4] he did not appear among the members of the board. Other important Puritan divines were represented, however. Richard Sibbes, John Davenport, Charles Offspring, and Richard Stock comprised the original four clerical feoffees, and later William Gouge was appointed to take the place left vacant by the death of Stock. In addition, other clergy were certainly involved in the scheme, and we have a letter from that accomplished politician, Hugh Peter, warmly indorsing the venture.[5] In addition to the four clerical members of the board, there were eight laymen--four lawyers and four citizens of London. Of these, the most important were Christopher Sherland, one of the Puritan leaders in parliament, and Sir Rolland Heylyn. As Fuller put it, "Here were four divines to persuade men's consciences, four lawyers to draw all·conveyances, and four citizens who commanded rich coffers."[6]

The plan apparently enjoyed considerable success. Sums were donated to the feoffees by pious Puritans, impropriations were purchased, and able Puritan lecturers were installed in strategic pulpits throughout England. It is interesting to note that in executing this scheme the goal of a Puritan parliament was not lost sight of. "It was resolved amongst them," wrote Heylyn, "to set up stipendary Lectures in all or most Market-Towns . . . . and of all Market-Towns to chuse such as were priviledged for sending Burgesses to the High-Court of Parliament."[7] To fill these lectureships, the feoffees picked zealous Puritan preachers, probably graduates of such Puritan strongholds as Emmanuel or Catherine Hall. Mercurius Civicus, a royalist writer at the opening of the Civil War, insisted that there had also been a "Practique Seminary" at St. Antholin's in London. This church had a number of lectureships attached to it, and these were used as "a place to traine up their young Emissaries, where they might take an Essay of their affections and abilities, and by the bewitchments of gaine and popular applause deeply ingage them in their Faction: and from this Seminary were most of their new bought Impropriations fill'd."[8] In addition, Mercurius noted that those who had suffered for the cause or who were highly recommended by such Puritan leaders as John White or John Cotton were given pulpits.[9]

---

[4] Heylyn, Part I, Book III, p. 134.

[5] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XXI (1645-47) (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1891), pp. 587-588. The entry is misplaced.

[6] Fuller, Church History, III, 362.

Yet all these efforts were doomed to failure. Sometime in 1630, Peter Heylyn, an ardent Anglican, began to suspect the truth, and following up his lead, soon uncovered the whole "plot."[10] In July of the same year he dramatically revealed his discoveries in a well-attended sermon at Oxford. Waxing eloquent, he cried

---

[7] Heylyn, Part I, Book III, p. 134.

[8] A Letter from Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus (1643), p. 6.

[9] *Ibid*. [10] Heylyn, Part I, Book III, p. 134.

> For what are those intrusted in the managing of this great Business? Are they not the most of them the most active and the best affected Men in the whole Cause, and Magna Partium Momenta, Chief Patrons of the Faction? And what are those whom they Prefer? Are they not most of them such as must be serviceable to their dangerous Innovations? And will they not in time have more Preferments to bestow, and therefore more Dependencies than all the Prelates in the Kingdom &c.[11]

Heylyn tells us that at these words, "a general constirnation shewed it self in the looks of his Auditors." The "Puritan Faction" met that same night and "conceived no punishment great enough to inflict upon him which either Law, Malice, or Revenge could expose him to."[12] Somewhat frightened, Heylyn sent a copy of his sermon to Laud and sought his protection, and soon the whole matter, now thoroughly exposed, was brought to the attention of the king. Prosecution of the feoffees was soon set in motion, and after a somewhat delayed process the board was suppressed in 1633.

There can be no doubt that the feoffees scheme constituted a grave danger to the old church. Fuller tells us that the venture was so promising that "it was verily believed, if not obstructed in their endeavours, within fifty years rather purchases than money would have been wanting unto them."[13] To Laud, the whole plan was "a cunning way, under a glorious Pretence, to overthrow the Church Government."[14] The success which the scheme achieved in this endeavor before its detection must have been such as greatly to excite the Puritan leaders, and we know that Hugh Peters exulted, "The Lord has given great success to the work, do what you possibly can in this business."[15] The fact that its exposure and dissolution followed so soon on the dismissal of parliament seems to have greatly disheartened and enervated the Puritan community. These defeats, concomitant with the inauguration of the rigorous policy which Laud was able to direct against the Puritans produced a great wave of despair and pessimism in the movement. By 1635 the general opinion was that which Sir Thomas Wroth expressed in a letter to John Stoughton, a prominent Puritan minister of London: "All things go on from worse to worse, in your parts, and the face of the affairs where I am, hath as unpleasing an aspect, so that I see no hopes of amendment."[16]

---

[11] Ibid., p. 135. [12] Ibid.

[13] Fuller, Church History, III, 362.

[14] Works of William Laud, IV, 303.

[15] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XXI (1645-47), pp. 587-588.

II

Puritan reaction to this comfortless situation primarily took two main forms. Some utterly despaired of ever securing a reformation in England and migrated to the freer climate of the Low Lands and New England, while others remained in England, concentrated on weathering the gale, and hoped for better times. Those who migrated were not inconsiderable in either numbers or quality. Both the Dutch and the American Puritan immigrants were strongly colored with Congregationalism, but not exclusively so, and the migration mentality seems to have been strong throughout the whole movement. To some extent this mentality originated in a fear of coming trials. John Winthrop, certain that God was bringing "some heauye Affliction vpon this lande, and that speedylye," prayed that He would "prouide a shelter and a hidinge place for vs and ours."[17] But to many the primary concern was that the church might flourish freely and openly without persecution or obstruction from a hostile magistrate. Thus, John Davenport justified his flight from England by professing his willingness to "lye and dye in prison, if the cause may be aduantaged by it, but choosing rather to preserue the liberty of my person and ministry for the seruice of the church elsewhere if all dores are shutt against mee here."[18]

---

[16] Ibid., Vol. VIII (1635) (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, & Green, 1865), p. 378.

[17] Winthrop Papers, II, 91-92.

The closest and most hospitable haven for emigrating Puritans was Holland. For almost a century silenced or ejected ministers and Puritans more radical than their fellows had sought temporary asylum in the Low Countries where the large communities of English merchants and soldiers provided disaffected clergy with the means of a respectable living in exile. Early in the reign of James I a Congregational classis was formed by most of the English ministers in the States, and this body continued until its subversion through the efforts of Laud in 1634.[19] Despite this blow a considerable number of Puritans, clergy and laity, continued to seek safety in Holland, and during the next few years the country was host to such famous preachers as Philip Nye, Thomas Goodwin, Jeremiah Burroughs, Sidrach Simpson, and many others. The connection of the emigration movement with the merchants seems to have been quite close, for on one occasion the exiled ministers were able to secure from the company the removal of a hostile deputy at Delft,[20] and when Davenport fled to Rotterdam it was "in one Humphrey his shipp, by the conduct and contrivance of Mr. Stone, a merchant in Coleman Street."[21]

---

[18] _Letters of John Davenport_, ed. Isabel MacBeath Calder (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937), p. 39.

[19] For a discussion of this whole movement in Holland, see Raymond Phineas Stearns, _Congregationalism in the Dutch Netherlands_ (Chicago: The American Society of Church History, 1940).

[20] Stearns, pp. 42-43.

[21] _Ibid_., p. 63; _Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I_, Vol. VI (1633-34) (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1863), p. 324.

Far more celebrated, of course, than the Puritan migrations to Holland was the exodus to the New World. The two movements were not entirely separate, for it was only after the downfall of the Congregational classis in the Netherlands that Puritan efforts were concentrated on Massachusetts, and a significant number of the ministers who had served in Holland also crossed the Atlantic to the new colony.[22] Puritan interest in New England was a matter of long standing, for John White, the Puritan "Patriarch of Dorchester," was a leader in the founding of the first of the colonizing companies.[23] But it was only after control had been taken over by the more radical and aggressive Easterners that the Massachusetts refuge really began to flourish. Beginning in 1629 and continuing in ever increasing numbers until 1640, waves of Puritan emigrants crossed the sea to build the new godly commonwealth in the New World.

The drama of the Puritan exodus to Holland and America, however, must not obscure the fact that by far the greater number of Puritans remained at home, and it is with these that we are primarily interested. Even among the Puritans the wholesale migrations did not elicit universal approval. Robert Ryece, an old friend of Winthrop's, wrote a strong letter to the future governor on the subject:

> The church and common welthe heere at home, hathe more need of your beste abyllytie in these dangerous tymes, then any remote plantation . . . . . You shalbe more acceptable in the service of the hieste and more vnder his protection whiles you walke clarely in your vocation heere.[24]

Much the same feeling was expressed by Sir Nathaniel Barnardiston in 1640 when he deplored how the cause had been "weakned by the loss of those that gonn from vs, who should haue stood in the gapp, and have wrought and wrasled mightely in this great busines."[25] The lot of those who "stood in the gapp" and "wrought and wrasled" against Laudian domination was indeed not a happy one. Since, for the most part, Puritanism as an organized party seems to have disappeared or at least disintegrated into a large number of local party groups throughout the kingdom, individual resistance became the principal Puritan weapon. Under the new conditions of strictly enforced conformity, what was needed was not a highly developed, centralized organization to carry on agitation for reformation but a dogged opposition on the part of every individual to all ecclesiastical innovations. Until the tide began to turn in 1638, emphasis was placed on survival rather than on reform.

---

[22] Stearns, pp. 71-72.

[23] Rose-Troup, John White, pp. 49-71.

[24] Winthrop Papers, II, 105-106.

Throughout that hectic decade of darkness for the movement, the English Puritan community constantly maintained its will to resist. "Now is the time to show our courage," wrote Sir Thomas Wroth despite his despair of any improvement in the situation, and such was the general mood of the movement.[26] Everywhere the introduction of high church ceremonies and liturgical practices was met with postponements, dodges of various sorts, petitions for redress, and even riots. In one county, it was noted that the orders of Sir Nathaniel Brent, Laud's visitor, were ignored, and "if a parson or vicar complain, the whole country cries out upon him, and watches to do him displeasure."[27] In another case, the churchwardens had to be excommunicated and even imprisoned before they would comply with the ecclesiastical policy.[28] The local magistrates and the lawyers were also generally on the side of Puritan resistance. The most celebrated case of this kind was the struggle of the justices of the peace and Lord Chief Justice Richardson against Laud over the enforcement of Sabbatarianism in 1632, though it must be admitted that much of this conflict seems characterized by the Erastian and anticlerical feeling which later proved so destructive of Puritanism itself.[29] Perhaps the most eloquent indication of the extent of Puritan resistance was the very general excitement which the various _causes célèbres_ produced. First in 1630 came the Scottish minister Alexander Leighton's trial for his seditious writings,[30] followed in 1634 by the process against the former parliament man, Henry Sherfield, for smashing a stained glass window in his parish church.[31] The greatest instance of this kind, of course, was the triple case of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton in 1637 whose outspokenness won them mutilation and imprisonment--public martyrdoms which did untold damage to the high church cause.[32]

---

[25] Ibid., IV, 218.

[26] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. VIII (1635), p. 378.

[27] Ibid., p. 26. Brent's valuable report of his visitation is given in ibid., pp. xxx-xlv.

As might be expected, it was on the Puritan clergy that the duty of resistance principally devolved. Both because they were obliged to be the most vocal leaders of the Puritan congregations and because they could be more easily disciplined than the laity, the clergy's share in the Laudian "persecution" was especially great. In attacking the preachers as the principal agents in the dissemination of Puritanism the government was undoubtedly acting on a sound premise. Though spoken of Samuel Ward, the minister of Ipswich, the comment of a government agent could equally well apply to most of the disaffected clergy: "Of the breeders of these persons, Mr. Ward of Ipswich is the chief of those parts, who, by preaching against the contents of the Book of Common Prayer and set prayer, and of a fear of altering our religion, has caused this giddiness."[33]

---

[28] Gardiner, VIII, 116-117.

[29] _Ibid._, VII, 319-320. [30] _Ibid._, pp. 143-151.

[31] _Ibid._, pp. 254-257. [32] _Ibid._, VIII, 226-231.

The ministers' chief weapon in resisting the domination of Charles and Laud was undoubtedly the sermon. To be sure, the Puritan press was not a negligible factor, for we know that pamphlets were sometimes shipped in from Holland,[34] and in 1636 the Bidhop of London complained that seditious tracts were written or dispersed by the clergy of his diocese.[35] Yet on the whole, Charles's efforts to muzzle the press met with substantial success, and it was the sermon that was obliged to carry the main burden of interpreting the political news and popularizing the Puritan cause among the populace. With the aid of the high churchmen, Charles was attempting to convert the pulpit into a potent medium of propaganda, and consequently political preaching was punished wherever it was discovered.[36] Nevertheless, Puritan ministers continued to trouble the government with seditious sermons, and the court of high commission was kept busy calling them to account. In 1633 White preached before the judges at the assizes and told them that "if Gods word bee a Commission by which Magistrates hold their places, it concerns them both to Rule according to the directions of that word, and besides to countenance, advance, and propagate, the Sacred Ordinances of God."[37] White's sermon was purposely rather ambiguous so that he escaped summons to court, but Ward of Ipswich received punishment the following year for stating that "the Church of England was ready to ring the Changes" and that "Religion and the Gospel stood on tiptoes, ready to be gone."[38] Perhaps the most outspoken of the Puritan preachers was Cornelius Burges. In 1636 we find him in trouble with the high commission for failing to bring in a copy of a questionable sermon. He claimed that he had "burned the same and therefore desired that the court would spare him in this particular," but the court conceived "this allegation to be elusory."[39] On one occasion he counselled his hearers, "If your ministers preach Popery or Arminianism you may change your dwelling and not trouble the peace of the Church";[40] and Laud complained of his "insolent passages against the bishops and the government of the Church."[41]

---

[33] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. VI (1633-34), p. 450.

[34] Ibid., p. 213. [35] Works of William Laud, V, 338.

[36] Davies, The Huntington Library Quarterly, III (1939-1940), 1-22.

[37] Rose-Troup, John White, pp. 285-286.

All this "seditious preaching" on the part of the Puritan ministers laid them open to severe penalties and quite frequently culminated in suspension or even excommunication. This was a matter of grave importance, for the continuance of the Puritan ministry was essential to the progress of the movement. Robert Ryece in his letters to New England records his apprehension at the time of a visitation,[42] and his fears were characteristic of most of the Puritan laity. To some extent, the dangers from the hierarchy could be overcome by seeking refuge in lectureships and chaplain-

---

[38] William Prynne, Canterburies Doome or the First Part of a Compleat History of the Committment, Charge, Tryall, Condemnation, Execution of William Laud Late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury (London: Michael Spark, 1646), p. 361. See also Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas.I, Vol. IX (1635-36), p. xlv.

[39] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. IX (1635-36), p. 497.

[40] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 242.

[41] Works of William Laud, V, 337-338.

[42] Winthrop Papers, III, 356.

C

cies which did not admit of the same sort of episcopal oversight as ordinary cures. Great numbers of Puritan ministers were supported by such lectureships, many of them in the gift of Puritan nobles and gentry or Puritan corporations. Apparently also there were itinerant lectureships, supported most likely by voluntary contribution, for Bishop Montague spoke of his discovery in Sussex of

> running Lecturers: who point upon such a day to meete at such a Church, most an end in some Country Town or Village: and then after Sermon, discourse of points proposed at their last meeting, by the head of that Classis or Assembly . . . . after all, they do again condicere,and appoint to meet next at such a Church, in like sort, to like purpose.[43]

A similar degree of security could be found for nonconformist ministers in chaplaincies. The Puritans themselves fully recognized the immunity which chaplains enjoyed, though the nobility's right to keep chaplains was not, as John Davenport told Lady Vere, guaranteed in Magna Charta.[44] But a number of preachers were finding refuge in the homes of influential laymen and causing Bishop Wren to complain, "What shall I do . . . . with those beneficed divines who take shelter in the houses of rich laity, and do not live upon their cures."[45]

At the same time, the great majority of ministers probably managed to remain in their livings by making small but timely concessions to the official church program. We have already seen the sort of ambiguous innuendo that Puritan divines were capable of, and in Essex the Puritan ministers seem to have devised a scheme of occasional conformity. According to Henry Jessy, a correspondent of the younger Winthrop, Laud charged the ministers with nonconformity only to be told by Stephen Marshall that he was misinformed.

---

[43] Prynne, p. 377; Daniel Neal, The History of the Puritans (London: William Baynes and Son, 1822), II, 249.

[44] Letters of John Davenport, p. 40.

[45] Neal, II, 258.

> Ay but said he do you conforme always? He ans[wered] he did somet[imes] but not alwa[ys] he was much employed in preaching and in catec[hising] the youth. The B[ishop] ans[wered] your prea[ching] I like wel and your Catec[hising] wondrous wel but I mislike your answers (which he spake angerly). you wear the Surpless sometimes and then you lay it aside from you for a long time, and what say your people then?[46]

Jessy's comment on the whole incident was that "these good men canot abide these ceremonies, and if they might they would never use them: But to avoid the Persecution of these Bishops that would fetch them up to the High Comm[ission] therefore these good men ar fain to stoop to them sometimes."[47] Quasi-conformity for prudence's sake was perhaps fairly wide-spread, for Thomas Shepard tells us in his Autobiography that when he attempted to evade Laud's questioning, the bishop "did shake as if he had been haunted with an Ague Fit" and declared "that he had been more cheated and equivocated with by some of my malignant Faction than ever Man by Jesuit."[48]

By means of all these efforts, Puritan resistance was slowly succeeding in defeating Laud's attempt to build a strong foundation for high church Anglicanism. If we can believe the Venetian agent in England, English Puritanism had even become stronger during the "persecution." By July, 1637, he could report that the Puritans had "increased enormously," and that "the more [the king] tries to extirpate them the stronger they become."[49] Apparently the Puritan cause gained considerable strength by Laud's alienation of the religious moderates, for a little later in the same year we hear that "many of the Protestants themselves, scandalised by the new institutions, become Puritans for fear of falling into Catholicism if they follow them."[50] The Puritans themselves did not underestimate their continuing vitality, and even in the dark year 1633 Henry Jessy could write, "God is not yet departed, he walks sometimes in our Gardens, and makes some dead herbs to live and blossome, both elder and younger in these cold seasons."[51]

---

[46] Winthrop Papers, III, 59. [47] Ibid.

[48] "The Autobiography of Thomas Shepard," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts: Transactions, XXVII (1927-1930), 369.

[49] Cal.S.P., Venet., Vol. XXIV (1636-39), p. 242.

III

Puritan resistance to the high church attack was the principal task of the movement during the decade of personal rule. But although party activity was difficult and dangerous, party organization does not seem to have been completely abandoned. It is probably true that much of the organization tended to disintegrate into its component parts, and certainly if there was a national leadership, it was content to remain quiescent. Nevertheless, there are indications that this surrender was only a concession of the moment and that the essential basis of the structure was carefully maintained.

Certainly at the very beginning of the period of personal rule there was a signal demonstration that the party was still capable of making itself felt politically. In setting up the Puritan commonwealth in Massachusetts, the emigrant leaders had a number of difficulties to overcome, and it seems certain that in doing so they availed themselves of the aid of powerful Puritan figures. Warwick's influence[52] and perhaps that of others as well was apparently used to obtain a patent for the colony, for Gorges wrote that "some of the discreeter sort . . . . made use of their friends to procure from the Councell for the affaires of New-England to settle a Colony within their Limits."[53] Moreover, through some surreptitious means the colonists secured the omission of the customary requirement for settling the seat of colonial government in London. It was the manner, wrote Winthrop in 1644,"for such as procured Patents for Virginia, Bermudas and the Weste Indies, to keep the chiefe Gouernment in the hands of the Company residinge in Engl[an]d, (and so this was intended and with much difficulty we gott it abscinded)."[54] In 1635 the Council of New England frankly accused the Massachusetts men of double dealing and complained that they had "labored and obtained unknown to us a confirmation of all this from his Majesty, and unwitting thereof."[55] The Puritans themselves admitted, though not publicly of course, that the privileges had been obtained "from his ma^{ts} espetiall grace, wth great cost, fauo^{r} of psonages of note, & much labo^{r}," and by this there can be little doubt that the great Puritan peers were intended.[56] At any rate, one of the Massachusetts men wrote that they were all "much bound" to Lords Say and Warwick[57] and urged that letters be written "aboundantly" to Warwick and others.[58]

---

[50] _Ibid_., p. 307. [51] _Winthrop Papers_, III, 143.

[52] Charles Harding Firth, "Robert Rich," _DNB_, Vol. XVI.

All this shows that there still existed in London a Puritan interest which could exert itself for the advancement of the movement. Nevertheless, it does seem true that use of the party organization for opposition to the Stuart regime on a national scale was largely ignored. But in many places Puritan groups did organize themselves locally to meet the onslaught. To a large extent, this opposition was bound up with the more inclusive parliamentary opposition which, during the decade when parliament was banished from the English political scene, was of necessity local in character. This did not mean that it was without effectiveness, however. Much strength was derived from the fact that the justices of the peace were generally local men to whom local interests were uppermost, and over these officials the council never succeeded in gaining any real measure of control. With the aid of these magistrates, the principal local leaders in those sections of the nation where dislike of Stuart rule was intense could act so as to embarrass the efforts of the crown. With regard to religion, such activity was frequently dedicated to the protection of Puritan ministers from the hierarchy, apparently with some success, for we hear that the commissary of Suffolk forbore to exhibit articles against Samuel Ward because he feared to "incur the hatred of Ward's adherents who are very potent in London and about Ipswich."[59]

---

[53] Miller, p. 143, quoting Sir Ferdinando Gorges, "Briefe Narration," J.P. Baxter, Sir Ferdinando Gorges and His Province of Maine, II, 58-59.

[54] Winthrop Papers, IV, 470.

[55] Justin Winsor (ed.), The Memorial History of Boston, Including Suffolk County, Massachusetts 1630-1880, I (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1880), 341.

[56] Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, ed. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, I (Boston: William White, 1853), 387.

[57] Winthrop Papers, II, 329. [58] Ibid.

Within the framework of this fairly universal opposition to Charles's rule, there was certainly some organized discontent of a more specifically Puritan character. It is in connection with the Puritan clergy that this discontent appears least in alloy with the other grievances, and it is to this purely religious aspect of the opposition that we direct our attention. Like the more inclusive, parliamentary opposition, any organized resistance of the Puritan ministry was largely local. Although our evidence is not abundant, it seems altogether likely that the Puritan ministry in every town and country area formed a rather close-knit community by reason of the identity of problems, interests, and aims. Often extraordinarily able ministers rose to win a kind of domination over these local fellowships. Thus Marshall became a spokesman for some of the nonconforming clergy of Essex, Burges gained the attention of the government by his leadership of the London divines, and White won the appellation "Patriarch of Dorchester." It is extremely doubtful that many of these groups of local Puritan clergy possessed any sort of formal organization. Certainly, however, they must have met to deal with local problems or whenever it was deemed expedient to join in protest against the Laudian policy. For the most part, we are treading on uncertain ground here, but in one regard we have assurance that ministers were frequently meeting together. This appears in connection with the Puritan exploitation of the combination lectureship--an institution whereby the local clergy engaged to supply a pulpit with preachers from their number. Bishop Montague took cognizance of this development in his visitation articles, and defined the combination lectureship as "when many neighbouring Ministers do voluntarily agree . . . . to preach a Sermon, every man in his course at some adjoyning market town, upon the market day."[60] It is evident that meetings concerning the combination were actually held, for the diarist, John Rous, tells us that an announcement was made in the church at Bury that "the ministers of the combination wold meete to consulte of the making of the combination, that those ministers that wold doe good might be put in seasonably for it."[61] An even clearer indication that local organizations of Puritan ministers were not completely dead was the action of "divers Ministers of God's Word in and about the city of London and elsewhere" in drawing up a petition for liberty to preach predestination, probably in 1638.[62]

---

[59] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. VI (1633-34), p. 450.

---

[60] Prynne, p. 377; Neal, II, 249.

In only a few cases are we permitted actual glimpses of meetings of such local ministerial organizations. As might be expected, Essex provides the most important evidence, for here there was an extraordinarily active and aggressive Puritan "classis," where the ministers held monthly fasts and consulted together on the business of the church in the area. In number they were between twelve and sixteen, and apparently had supervision over the disposition of the lectureships in that part of Essex. Thomas Shepard gives us an insight into their procedure when he tells us of the manner in which he was installed in a new lectureship financed by a Puritan layman:

> & when I was among those woorthies in Essex where we had monethly fasts; they did ppound it vnto me; to take the Lecture & to set it vp at a great town in Essex called Cogshall & so m^r Weld especially prest me vnto it & wished me to seeke god about it & after fasting & prayer the ministers in those parts of Essex had a day of Humiliatiō. & they did seeke the Lord for direction where to place the Lecture.[63]

Shepard goes on to say that most of the ministers were for Coggeshall except the great Thomas Hooker who objected that there was "an old yet sly & malicious minister in the town" and that "it was dangerous & vncomfortable for little birds to build vnder the nests of old rauens & kites."[64] In the end, another town was chosen, and Shepherd, by the unanimous vote of the ministers, was advised to accept. "& thus I who was so yong so weake & vnexperienced & vnfit for so great a woorke was called out by 12 or 16. ministers of X^{t} to the woorke."[65] Apparently this "classis" felt itself strong enough and daring enough to administer a rebuke to no less a person than Bishop Laud. Laud's visitation in 1631 was falling particularly heavy on the clergy of the Puritan country of Essex. As a result,

---

[61] Diary of John Rous, Incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk, from 1625 to 1642, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green ("Camden Society Publications," LXVI [London, 1856]), 68-69.

[62] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XIII (1638-39) (London: Longman & Co., 1871), pp. 279-280.

[63] "The Autobiography of Thomas Shepard," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts: Transactions, XXVII (1927-1930), 366.

> at Dunmow in Essex m^{r} Weld m^{r} Daniell Rogers m^{r} Ward m^{r} Marshall, m^{r} Wharton consulted together whether it was best to let such a swine to root up gods plants in Essex & not to giue him some check. Wherevpon it was agreed vpō priuatly at Braintry. that some should speake to him & giue him a check.[66]

So vigorous an organization would seem to be extraordinary rather than common, and it must be remembered that it was located in Puritan Essex and had Stephen Marshall for one of its leaders. Yet it does not seem fanciful to suppose that similar bodies were in existence in Puritan country throughout England. At any rate, Shropshire had such an organization by 1640, for Baxter records that when the Etcetera Oath was proclaimed, "the Ministers of the Country met together at Bridgnorth to Debate this Business, that they might have no Division."[67]

It was these local organizations of the Puritan divines which insured the continuity of party organization from 1629 to 1640. But in addition, it is interesting to observe that all the conditions were ripe for the emergence of a full-blown national organization after 1640. There is ample evidence that throughout the period of personal rule Puritan divines, however isolated they might be, thought of themselves as belonging to a great fellowship that was national in extent.[68] Certainly, there must have been a heavy correspondence between ministers, though few letters have been preserved, and the most interesting ones were probably destroyed for safety's sake by their owners. In 1635 when John Stoughton's study was raided by order of the government a large number of important letters were found, including communications from John White and Stephen Marshall.[69] There was considerable correspondence with the Puritan colonies in the Low Countries and New England also, and the council had information of "Mr. D. Stoughton's great correspondency with our fugitive inconformable English ministers beyond the seas."[70]

---

[64] Ibid. [65] Ibid. [66] Ibid., p. 370.

[67] Reliquiae Baxterianae, Part I, p. 16.

It seems, moreover, that the clergy were not obliged to rely on correspondence to keep in touch with one another, for there are a few indications that actual meetings of important clerical leaders took place. Thus in 1629 the leaders of the Massachusetts Bay Company determined to select ministers for the colony and called a meeting of the leading Congregational clergy to aid in the selection. "We doe therefore . . . . entreate you . . . . to afford vs your presence in this Citty the ninthe day of November," went the form letter, "to ioyne with such other of your brethren as we shall likewise request to be present heere."[71] This meeting undoubtedly had a strong Congregational coloring, but others were more broadly Puritan in character. Such, perhaps, were the rather notorious gatherings of Puritan clergy at the seat of the Earl of Warwick. According to Clarendon the earl attained a position of leadership in the party by "opening his doors and making his house the rendezvous of all the silenced ministers, in the time when there was authority to silence them, and spending a good part of his estate, of which he was very prodigal, upon them."[72] It may be that there was even some sort of ministers' board at London, though this fact must ever be questionable since it comes from a Roman Catholic source of the eighteenth century--a very poor source. At any rate, the tradition was that "Dr. Sibs and the other Presbyterian ministers sate at London as a committee for carrying on their cause."[73] Though there may have been no formal organization of this type, the statement is probably correct in attributing to the important Puritan ministers of London a high degree influence and control over the movement.

---

[68] Even in far-off Massachusetts, there was a strong feeling of community with English Puritans. At the dismissal of the Short Parliament, Edward Winslow wrote to John Winthrop in July, 1640: "What will be the issue of these sore beginnings the Lord onely knoweth, but it concerneth us deeply to be affected with them as a people that must share with them in weale and woe." Winthrop Papers, IV, 262.

[69] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 297, n. 9.

[70] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. IX (1635-36), p. 48.

[71] Winthrop Papers, II, 163-164.

Something in the way of a new clerical leadership was also rising to the fore. After Preston's death there was no minister with sufficient political astuteness to compensate for his loss, and at the same time a number of the older Puritan ministerial leaders passed from the scene. The result was that during the decade of personal rule a number of Puritan divines were winning an eminence which was to be fully developed after the meeting of the Long Parliament. As was always the case in the history of Puritanism, the leadership of the clergy was similar to that of an Erasmus or Voltaire; it was never a formal presidency, but rather a vague and undefined primacy bestowed on the man of superior ability. Even more so than at other times, this was the case between 1629 and 1640, for the Puritan campaign was pretty much at a stand-still. Nevertheless, certain clergymen were regarded as being the leaders of the nonconforming ministers, and on most questions of importance their advice was sought. Usually they were consulted regarding the choice of sound men for lectureships, and we are told that during the earlier part of this period such posts were commonly filled by ministers who could produce "letters testimonial from Patriarch White of Dorchester, Mr. Cotton of Boston, or such like, (for Calamy and Marshall were not, as it is said of Dathan and Abiram, as yet famous in the congregation)."[74] Though Sibbes died shortly afterward, he and William Gouge must also have been looked up to as leaders. Both men had grown old in the service of Puritanism and both had been members of the feoffees board. That they still retained something of their old hold over the movement is shown by Laud's rebuke to some citizens of Colchester when they asked him to sanction the appointment of a Puritan lecturer. "When you want one," he replied angrily, "you must go first to Dr. Gouge, and to Dr. Sibs and then you come to me, I scorn to be so used."[75] Not only the selection of lecturers, however, but other problems of the movement were submitted to clerics who attained the status of national leaders. A royalist's judgment of White could have applied to almost any of the other leading divines with equal justice: "His meere Intimation of things to be done, or not to be done had more influence on his brethren of the Ministry then the Commands of their Bishop."[76] Perhaps the development most significant for the future was the emergence of Marshall and Burges, first as leaders of their own local groups and then as heads of the movement on a national scale.

---

[72] Clarendon, III, 560-561.

[73] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 289.

---

[74] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 6.

[75] Winthrop Papers, III, 59.

[76] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 291.

Only in one case do the Puritan ministers seem to have engaged in any important scheme to advance Puritan control over the church, and even this had only rudimentary organization. In 1635 the government got wind of the fact that considerable sums of money were passing between John White and John Stoughton of London, and it immediately concluded that it was dealing here with the operations of a "Puritan purse."[77] The authorities had every reason to be suspicious since White was a notorious Puritan, and Stoughton, though less widely known, was an important Congregational preacher who three years earlier had been invited by Governor Winthrop to become minister of the First Church of Boston.[78] Laud gave order to arrest the two preachers and search their papers, taking care to despatch the messenger for Dorset first "for if Dr. S. be touched here, present intelligence will be sent thither."[79] When examined before Sir John Lambe, dean of the Arches, White admitted that he and Stoughton had dispensed payments to various ministers and also confessed that he had "received divers other collections of money & collected in Pious usus the particular somes" but "of whom he received them or how he disposed of them he cannot p^{r}sently call to mind but refereth himself to his notes or books."[80] The result of the examinations was that White and Stoughton were accused before the high commission of "secret and sly practices against the well-settled government of the Church and State ecclesiastical,"[81] and although the ministers escaped without serious punishment, there can be little doubt that something similar to the suppressed feoffees corporation was clandestinely functioning. Details are lacking, but we can assume that most of the money was expended for the support of Puritan ministers.[82] The Continental Reformed churches were thought of, however, and the ecumenical leader, John Dury, received £150.[83] It is certain that the "Puritan purse" embraced the activities of a number of divines, and that Stoughton and White were only the unlucky ones that got caught. As might be expected, Stephen Marshall was involved in the movement. Some of his letters were found in Stoughton's study,[84] and two years later he confessed to Sir Nathaniel Brent that Lady Barnardiston gave £200 "to be bestowed by his direction."[85] Marshall was evidently an important figure in the organization of the "Puritan purse," for Brent wrote to Laud that "he governeth the consciences of all the rich Puritans in those parts and in many places far remote."[86] In all probability the "Puritan purse"was a continuation of the feoffees scheme on a smaller scale and without formal organization.

---

[77] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. VIII (1635), pp. 435-436.

[78] Winthrop Papers, III, 88-89.

[79] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. VIII (1635), pp. 435-436.

[80] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 298, quoting State Papers, Domestic, Charles I., 301. No. 4; Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. VIII (1635), p. 459.

Although it is among the clergy that Puritan organization appears in its most pure form, it is impossible to ignore the important lay figures whose influence in the party was at least equal to that of the clergy. The ministerial leaders themselves recognized that without the co-operation of the influential laymen they would be powerless to effect any changes in the ecclesiastical situation in England. At the same time, laymen were often among the most sincere and ardent adherents of the movement and accepted the responsibilities of leadership as fully as any of the preachers. The result was that the two elements in the party always attempted to work together harmoniously. We know that a good deal of correspondence passed between the clergy and Puritan laymen, as is shown, for instance, in Winthrop Papers and in the published letters of John Davenport. The nature of the letters must have necessitated their being quickly destroyed, and in at least one case a false address was employed, for the government got hold of "a dangerous or seditious letter sent from one Thomas Wroth to D Stoughton, but to colour the matter, directed to a lady in Coleman Street."[87] Furthermore, contact between clerical and lay leaders was maintained not only by writing but also by close personal association. Many nobility and gentry presented to the local livings or kept lecturers, chaplains, or tutors, and with these ministers they were accustomed to live on intimate terms. The strong tie which existed between John White and Denzil Holles has already been mentioned, and in the journal of Lady Brilliana Harley we see the same familiarity between the Harley family and Stanley Gower.[88] These purely local relationships, however, had not the significance which attached to the friendships between lay and clerical leaders. We know, for instance, that Sibbes was on intimate terms with the great Rich family,[89] and we have already seen how Marshall governed the consciences of many rich Puritans "in many places far remote." Probably the great Puritan peers were the nominal and even the real leaders of the movement until the peerage began to be eclipsed by the strong commons leadership after the sitting of the Long Parliament. Say and Brooke were important, but Warwick was undoubtedly the greatest of the Puritan lords. Calamy called him "a great patron and Maecenas to the pious and religious ministry,"[90] and he does in fact seem to have promoted and protected Puritan clergy wherever possible. His brother, the Earl of Holland, also flirted with Puritanism, and when John Stoughton was released from the high commission he rode home in Holland's coach.[91]

---

[81] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 302.

[82] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. VIII (1635), p. 459.

[83] Ibid., p. 500. In 1637 Sir Nathaniel Brent wrote that Marshall had confessed that "he gave 150 l. (as he saith) to one Mr. Duraeus" (Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. X [1636-37] [London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867], p. 545).

[84] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. X (1636-37), p. 545.

[85] Ibid. [86] Ibid.

---

[87] Ibid., Vol. VIII (1635), p. 378.

[88] Letters of the Lady Brilliana Harley, Wife of Sir Robert Harley, of Brampton Bryan, Knight of the Bath, ed. Thomas Taylor Lewis ("Camden Society Publications," LVIII [London, 1854]), passim.

[89] Charles Harding Firth, "Robert Rich," DNB, Vol. XVI.

These activities of clergy and laity and of clergy and laity together give abundant indication that the party was far from dead. Assuredly, it was in most respects dormant, for in the face of the king's apparent victory over parliament it was futile to push the Puritan campaign. Only in cases which involved the preservation of Puritanism itself--that is, in the support of the Puritan ministry in England and in the establishment of a Puritan refuge overseas--do we find anything like the use of a party organization approaching national proportions. But nebulous as it might be, there was nevertheless a real Puritan leadership and a real party unity which throughout the period of darkness was scrupulously though informally maintained. It was on these bases that the party was able, after the return of hope in 1640, to become once more a great force on the English political scene.

IV

The beginning of the troubles in Scotland in 1638 was recognized as a blessing to the cause of English Puritanism. So greatly did the Scottish successes embarrass the king and the high churchmen and correspondingly favor the Puritans and their allies that Charles was sure that "the northern commotions had their root in England."[92] Whatever truth there was in the king's suspicions, it is certain that the Puritans refused to regard the northern invasions in any other light but that of a providential deliverance. Thus it was that when defeats in the north and discontent at home combined to break Charles's will, John Venn, a future parliament member, could write exultantly that "God hath called a parlamente."[93] A few weeks before the Short Parliament opened, Puritan forces were apparently organizing themselves as a pressure group, for Matthew Cradock told John Winthrop that "yf you shall thinke of owght fitt to bee mooued in parlament Consider seriousley of it with the Court there . . . . and vppon nottice of your desires I doubt not but to fynd meanes to furder the same."[94] On the whole, however, the first parliament of 1640 was much too short to produce anything of promise, and even the fast day sermons, though scheduled, were cancelled by the hasty dissolution.[95]

---

[90] _Ibid_. [91] _Diary of John Rous_, pp. 79-80.

The interim period between the two parliaments must have been fraught with party activity. The great Puritan nobles were in touch with the Scottish leaders,[96] and in August was held a secret meeting of the national opposition comprised of Essex, Warwick, Bedford, Russell, Say, Brooke, Pym, and Hampden.[97] The clergy too were active in building up pressure to obtain a favorable parliament. They helped undermine the king's position by playing up the clerical opposition to the recent canons, and the ministers of London sent a strong petition to the king by the hand of Cornelius Burges.[98] Probably also, many of them were involved in political preaching just prior to the elections.[99] As a result the new parliament--the famous Long Parliament--was colored by a strong Puritan character, though it must be admitted that it was a Puritanism with which Erastianism was not incompatible.

---

[92] _Works of William Laud_, III, 279.

[93] _Winthrop Papers_, IV, 221.

[94] _Ibid_., p. 207. [95] _C.J._, II, 9.

[96] Gardiner, IX, 178-179. [97] _Ibid_., p. 198.

It was perfectly natural that the king's summons for a new parliament was the signal for all those dissatisfied with Laudianism to begin a lobbying and propaganda campaign designed to win the members to the cause of ecclesiastical reform. But it must be emphasized that the petitions with which the members were bombarded were not all of uniform character. Some seem to have been spontaneous expressions of the very general discontent, and though they were sincere in wanting a complete repudiation of Laudianism, they would certainly have accepted--indeed preferred--a reformed episcopal Establishment. In addition to this spontaneous feeling, however, there was the organized party campaign which went beyond the demands of the country at large and soon found itself obliged to place itself in opposition to them.

The first program was given expression in the first few weeks of the session, primarily in the petitions from the shires.

---

[98] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVII (1640-41) (London: Longmans& Co., 1882), p. 74.

[99] There had been a good deal of electioneering sermons just before the Short Parliament, and it seems reasonable to suppose that such efforts would be doubled for the Long Parliament. See Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVII (1640-41), pp. 581-582; Ibid., Vol. XV (1639-40), p. 609.

The petitions of Hertfordshire,[100] London,[101] Yorkshire,[102] Kent,[103] Lincoln,[104] and two of Dorsetshire[105] have survived and bear witness to the country's general dissatisfaction with the Laudian policy and its desire for conservative reform. For the most part, they sought the removal of the instruments of pressure employed by the high church party to secure uniformity. Specifically, this meant the relaxation of the etcetera oath, the churchwardens' oath, and the _ex officio_ oath--all of them devices to ferret out and incriminate Puritan divines.[106] Following up this complaint, most of the petitions protested against the Laudian ritual--"the intruding and countenancing of divers new Ceremonies in matters of Religion, as placing the Communion-Table Alterwise, and bowing or cringing to or towards the same."[107] Beyond denouncing these grievances, the petitions usually contented themselves with condemning the corruption of the Anglican incumbents and the prohibition of preaching on week days.

In addition to this moderation and conservatism, the petitions seem to have been both universal and spontaneous. That the nation was united in wishing some retrenchment from the Anglo-Catholic religious policy was eloquently displayed in the fact that the petitions represented not only the Puritan south and east, but the north as well. Men of all constitutional parties, moreover, were zealous in their support. Of the men who presented petitions, all with the exception of Alderman Pennington, the member for London, fought with the king in the Civil War, and of these, several were determined advocates of the preservation of episcopal government. The most important generalization that can be made about these early appeals, however, is their apparently complete innocence of party affiliations. Certainly, there is no evidence that any of them were other than free and unsolicited, while in some cases like that of Dorsetshire we have positive assurance that they are genuine expressions of local sentiment.

---

[100] _C.J._, II, 22; _The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes from the Beginning of the Long Parliament of the Opening of the Trial of the Earl of Strafford_, ed. Wallace Notestein (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923), p. 5.

[101] _C.J._, II, 23; _Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament_, p. 16.

[102] _C.J._, II, 24; _Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament_, p. 19.

[103] _C.J._, II, 24.

[104] _Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament_, p. 38.

[105] Rushworth, III, 1337-1338.

[106] _Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament_, p. 5.

[107] Rushworth, III, 1338.

At first the distinction between these demands and those emanating from the party organization did not become readily apparent. All men united against the abuses of the old church, and in the general condemnation differences in the degree of radicalism were apt to be overlooked. It was not long, however, before the men who feared a strong Puritan Establishment with its pope in every parish began to capitalize on the evident desire of the nation for a conservative reformation. The union of English conservatism and Erastianism was a very grave danger to Puritan aspirations, and the party organization had to be highly effective indeed if it was to emerge victorious.

CHAPTER VI

SOURCES OF PARTY STRENGTH: 1640-1642

When the Long Parliament met in 1640 the golden age of Puritan party organization had begun. Although within a few months the "Puritan" commons had asserted its superiority, such party organization was by no means superfluous. To Puritanism there was always a determined opposition--opposition that stemmed not only from an aggressive and resurgent Anglicanism, but from Erastianism, secularism, and English conservatism as well. Ultimately these latter forces, aided by dissensions within Puritanism itself, were powerful enough to spell the ruin of political Puritanism in England, but for the moment they furthered the Puritan cause by joining in the effort to pull down the Laudian church. Reliance on such an alliance was strategically imprudent, however, and Puritan leaders labored to secure a firm base for Puritan victories by building up a highly developed party organization.

To the discerning eye, the need for such party organization and party activity was apparent immediately after the sitting of the houses, for it seems fairly evident from the petitions on religion that the country wanted no really radical changes in the church. To be sure, the protest against the recent innovations was both widespread and deep, but in few cases does there seem to have been anything more than a conservative demand, strongly tinged with anticlericalism, to return to the old Protestant faith as it had flourished--or as men were pleased to think it had flourished--in the days of Elizabeth. It was against this typically English religious conservatism that the more radical Puritan reformers were forced to contend.

The strength which Puritanism could muster for this contest was derived principally from the constant and effective pressure which the party could exert from its special citadels of strength. In 1640 these citadels were four in number. First and perhaps most important were the Puritan clergy who by reason of their effective organization and ministerial ascendancy with the populace were able to exert an influence which far exceeded their numerical strength. Closely seconding the power controlled by the Puritan clergy was the influence exercised by Puritanism's allies: the City and the Scots. Though not predominantly clerical in their leadership, both these allies were thoroughly committed to the Puritan cause and did their utmost to establish a Puritan church in England. Lastly, these three forces were united with a fourth, the Puritan bloc in parliament, to secure from that body the completion of a thorough reformation. What was the most productive of Puritan strength, however, was that these various forces did not conduct their efforts in isolation but united in a common, co-operative endeavor to effect a program of concerted action.

I

Undoubtedly, the basis of much of the power of the Puritan party was the prestige and influence of the pulpit. "What won them most repute," wrote Thomas Fuller of the Elizabethan Puritans, "was their ministers' painful preaching in populous places; it being observed in England, that those who hold the helm of the pulpit always steer people's hearts as they please."[1] The world had changed somewhat since Elizabeth sat on the throne, but Fuller's estimate of the great place of the clergy still rang true. To be sure, the preoccupation of Tudor-Stuart England with religious problems was beginning to be sharply challenged as the century advanced, yet it was still marked enough to insure for the clergy a position of influence and leadership. The parish was the primary unit to which men gave their allegiance, and theology and the state of one's soul were the principal subjects of conversation. In such a community, the minister was the natural leader and his sermon the chief--in some cases the only--intellectual, spiritual, and moral sustenance of the people. But equally important with this religious leadership of the parish was the political influence that inevitably attended it. In part, this influence was a reflection of the inseparability of religious and political interests in the seventeenth century, but to a far greater extent it was the result of the place of the sermon as the most effective vehicle for the dissemination of news and expression of political opinion.

---

[1] Fuller, Church History, III, 102.

The political power of the clergy in the molding of public opinion was ignored by neither the government nor the Puritans. Tudor government had constantly drawn on the propaganda potentialities of the pulpit, both in the publishing of official proclamations and in the more subtle device of intimating to the clergy the policy of the sovereign. Under Elizabeth, this practice had become a regular political stratagem, and Heylyn tells us that she "used to tune the Pulpits, as her saying was" whenever she was in special need of a show of popular support.[2] After the turn of the century, the more careless administration of the new dynasty plus the growing numbers of militant, disaffected clergy made the pulpit less amenable to control, but the Stuarts still considered it as of immense value. Beginning in 1618 and especially in the decade of Charles's personal rule, they made strenuous efforts to exploit fully the loyal clergy as royalist propagandists and to silence or expel discordant Puritan elements. This policy was vigorously pushed right up to the time when all controls broke down in 1640, and at least one historian, Godfrey Davies, has seen the control of the pulpit as a decisive factor in the success or failure of Charles's "absolutism":

---

[2] Heylyn, Part I, Book III, p. 103. I am indebted for this reference to Davies, The Huntington Library Quarterly, III (1939-1940), 14.

> Whether he or his opponents would prevail depended largely upon whether he could enlist on his side the mass of Englishmen. The press could be controlled and political meetings were almost unknown. There remained the most influential of all the organs or public opinion--the pulpit, with whose control was largely bound up the future of the English constitution.[3]

This high value which the Stuarts placed on the possession of the pulpits was shared by the Puritans and their allies. For the most part, Puritan ministers fought royal domination by refusing to be silent on important issues. Despite the efforts of the council, incendiary and seditious sermons were frequent, and on certain questions, such as the Book of Sports, sermonic opposition became a flood. Furthermore, to break the force of hierarchical oversight, every effort was made to avoid the controls of licensing, oaths, and visitations. Probably the most successful weapon in this campaign was the development of the lecture system, by which Puritan preachers could be introduced into churches officially served by clergy unsympathetic to Puritanism. This lecture system had proved so successful that the party had attempted to expand it tremendously by the establishment of the short-lived feoffees of impropriations board. Prior to 1640 these activities were necessarily sub rosa, but after the meeting of the Long Parliament the Puritans with parliamentary support attempted to secure control of the pulpit on a grand scale. The earliest acts of the commons had the result of depriving Anglican churchmen of the use of their power and clearing the way for Puritan supremacy in the churches. By the opening of the Civil War, the lecture system had been fully legalized[4] and many royalist clergy had been replaced by Puritan preachers loyal to the parliament.[5] In pursuing this policy, the nature of the parliament's action was perfectly clear to all. "Because," charged an embittered royalist a few years later, "they would be sure to have an Orator in every Pulpit to quicken the people, to poure out their wealth Liberally, to further the Rebellion intended, they cause the dregs, and scum of every Parish, to petition against the Orthodox Clergy: who being imprisoned, or fled, they sequester their Livings, for the use of their owne Levites."[6] Thus, the parliamentary party was not only satisfying the clerical element within its own ranks, but, like the royal government before 1640, was attempting to build up a powerful propaganda organization in the churches. This high tribute which both governments paid to the political influence of the ministry received its most dramatic expression from Charles himself. "Certainly," wrote the imprisoned monarch in 1646, "if the pulpits teach not obedience (which will never be if presbyterian government be absolutely established), the King will have but small comfort in the militia."[7]

---

[3] Davies, _The Huntington Library Quarterly_, III (1939-1940), 7.

---

[4] C.J., II, 283. See the discussion of the order in The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes from the First Recess of the Long Parliament to the Withdrawal of King Charles from London, ed. Willson Havelock Coates (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), pp. 19-20.

[5] The Committee on Scandalous Ministers to carry out this policy was set up December 19, 1640 (C.J., II, 54).

[6] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 26.

As both crown and parliament confessed, the English pulpit, whether Anglican or Puritan, was a powerful propaganda weapon, but it was the Puritan pulpit which brought the political influence of the sermon to its greatest height. Much of the success of the Puritan preachers lay in their method. Both as "painful" preachers and as conscientious pastors, the Puritan ministers everywhere won recognition of their leadership, while their Anglican opponents were not uncommonly reputed to be immoral, ignorant, and without preaching ability. Envious royalist writers might complain that the Puritan clergy were "the dryest and the dullest beasts that ever peepd over a pulpit,"[8] but such was not the opinion of contemporaries. Scorning the use of art and wit but relying on homely similes and familiar examples, the Puritans developed a sermon that was clear, logical, and compelling in its power.

The great value of the Puritan sermon as a weapon against conservative Anglicanism became more apparent as the struggle entered its crucial stages. In the past the Puritans had often preached incendiary sermons, as the royalists called them, but beginning in 1640 when episcopal controls broke down, the Puritan ministry everywhere boldly championed the parliamentary cause and launched a violent attack on the old church and its protectors. Even before the Long Parliament convened, the great Puritan minister, Calybute Downing, had preached a sermon sanctioning resistance to the crown for the sake of reformation of the church. The council was highly offended at the sermon, and Downing was obliged to flee London.[9] But by the end of the year political sermons of even greater audacity were by no means extraordinary. This growing radical climate was noted by Baillie only a fortnight after the opening of parliament. "Manie ministers," he wrote, "used greater freedome than ever here was heard of. Episcopacie it self beginning to be cryed down, and a Covenant cried up, and the Liturgie to be scorned."[10] As the work of the Long Parliament proceeded and the determination of the king to defend the church became more clearly evident, the propaganda potentialities of the Puritan sermon were increasingly exploited. "Our new Preachers," complained a contemporary London witness, "entertaine their Auditories with newes . . . . or else with bitter invectives against the King and his Governement; . . . . all their exhortations now, are to Treason and Rebellion."[11]

---

[7] Davies, The Huntington Library Quarterly, III (1939-1940), 22, quoting Charles I in 1646, ed. John Bruce, p. 79.

[8] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 27.

Perhaps this very bitterness against the Puritan sermon on the part of royalists was the most eloquent tribute to its effectiveness. Royalist writers never tired of condemning the Puritan sermons on Sunday which brought crowds of demonstrators to Westminster on Monday, and Cornelius Burges received special attention as one who could direct tremendous popular pressure on the parliament if he did but "hold up his finger to his mirmidons."[12] In addition, the complaint was made that these efforts, impressive in themselves, were rendered far more effective by the enforced unanimity of sermons throughout the City. Meeting frequently at the house of Edmund Calamy, the clerical leaders were charged with regulating the line the Sabbath sermons were to take, with the result that "you shall have one, and the same argument possesse most of our Pulpit, on the same day, the same matter, is the Subject, either of their rayling invectives, or Rebellious Exhortations."[13] Whether this was actually the case or not, it is certain that at moments of special crisis, such as the attempted arrest of the five members, the Puritan clergy reacted in impressive unison. The effect of the sermons was undoubtedly tremendous, and though Mercurius's conclusion that "these Military Preparations had effected Little, had not the fire been given from the Pulpit" may be somewhat extravagant, it nevertheless had considerable basis in fact.[14] Hacket, sometime secretary to the former Lord Keeper Williams, was no high churchman, but he too saw the Puritan victories over the old church largely as the result of the effectiveness of the party's pulpit propaganda on the populace. "The power of the Presbyterians," he asserted, "was so great in Tumults and concourse of base People, that their Conclusions were strong, though their Premisses were weak, to blunt the power of ancient Episcopacy."[15]

---

[9] Ibid., pp. 8-9; Ronald Bayne, "Calybute Downing," DNB, Vol. V.

[10] The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, 1841), I, 273. (Hereafter cited as Baillie.)

[11] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 26.

[12] Anthony à Wood, Athenae Oxonienses. An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford (London: F.C. and J. Rivington, 1817), III, 682; A Letter from Mercurius, p. 9.

That the Puritans' conclusions were strong, however, must not be attributed solely to their sermon eloquence. For in addition to the pressure exerted from the pulpit, the Puritans possessed the complementary power of a highly developed party organization which the ministers had formed among themselves. That such organization existed was never doubted by contemporaries, though the details of its workings were probably never entirely understood. To be sure, it was everywhere recognized that such Puritan divines as Stephen Marshall, Cornelius Burges, Edmund Calamy, Calybute Downing, and John White possessed power and importance far beyond that of isolated individual preachers. But for most men the details of the clergy's organization seem never to have emerged into clear focus, and one senses that the Puritan leaders recognized that much of the strength of the party depended on precisely such obscurity.

---

[13] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 27.

[14] Ibid., p. 5. [15] Hacket, Part II, p. 144.

It was in its leadership that the ministers' organization became most apparent. During the twenties of the century, it was widely recognized that "Preston governed the Affairs of the Puritan faction,"[16] while during the nightmare of Charles's personal rule, Cotton and White had attained a similar though much lesser ascendancy.[17] Without a doubt, the Puritan leaders in 1640 were Stephen Marshall and Cornelius Burges, and were regarded as such by both parties in the approaching struggle. From the very first, the parliament signalized their pre-eminence by inviting them to preach at its first fast,[18] while in the opposite camp Clarendon paid them the fine tribute that Laud "had never so great an influence upon the counsell at Court as Dr Burges and Mr Marshall had then upon the Houses."[19]

Of the two, probably Stephen Marshall was the more able. Certainly he was more consistent in his policy and was able to retain leadership of the radical Puritan reformers longer than was Burges. Apparently he was a brilliant preacher. Baillie confessed that Marshall was the best preacher in England,[20] and even his hostile biographer admitted that "he preach'd Catechistical Divinity . . . . in as plain and familiar Expressions as could be, that he might suit himself to the meanest Capacity, and gain the People."[21] This gift and the use to which he put it led later writers not incorrectly to regard him as the chief clerical figure behind the revolution, and his title of "primate of the Presbyterian church" points up the dominating position that he must have held. In character he seems to have possessed a temperament not unlike that of Preston--diplomatic, politically adept, and shrewd even to the point of cunning. As early as 1637, Sir Nathaniel Brent, Laud's visitor, found himself no match for the wily divine. Mr. Marshall . . . .," he wrote to the archbishop,

---

[16] Heylyn, Part I, Book III, p. 134.

[17] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 6.

[18] C.J., II, 23-24; Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, p. 18.

[19] Clarendon, II, 25.

> is held to be a dangerous person, but exceeding cunning. No man doubteth but that he hath an inconformable heart, but externally he observeth all . . . . . It is fit, in mine opinion that Mr. Chancellor of London should have a watchful eye over him, in regard he governeth the consciences of all the rich Puritans in those parts and in many places far remote.[22]

Equally revealing and much to the same purpose was the historian Fuller's comment that "he was of so supple a soul, that he brake not a joint, yea, sprained not a sinew in all the alteration of times."[23] To this endowment Marshall added a tireless energy and an unquenchable zeal for the parliament's cause. The result was that he seems to have become the most politically skillful and influential of all the Puritan preacher-politicians. "That he was of all Clergy-men, the most mischievous to his Sovereign," wrote his anonymous biographer, "is without Controversie, every where robbing him of the Hearts of his Subjects, creating Jealousies in them, stirring them up to Arms and Contributions of Moneys, engaging all Persons of Quality, whom he had any hopes to work upon."[24]

---

[20] Baillie, II, 148.

[21] The Godly Man's Legacy, p. 8.

[22] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. X (1636-37) (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867), p. 545.

[23] Fuller, Worthies, II, 105.

Cornelius Burges, "a very black man of middling stature,"[25] is a more difficult character to understand. During the early days of the Long Parliament he was unquestionably one of the principal leaders in the Puritan attack on the Laudian church. Later on, however, he broke with his former Presbyterian friends, and proclaimed that he went so far only as to advocate a reformed episcopacy. Certainly he was always somewhat conservative, and by February of 1641 we find Baillie telling us that the Scots suspected him as "too much Episcopall."[26] Perhaps he was simply a consistent Episcopal Puritan, but it may be that, like so many of his contemporaries, he became frightened at the increasing radicalism of the times and sought partially to retrace his steps. Whatever explanation we may assign to his later conduct, it is certain that in the early period he was one of the most able organizers of the Puritan forces. Even before the opening of the Long Parliament, Burges had become the chief spokesman for the London Puritan clergy, and in 1640 he was chosen by them to present a petition to the king against the canons of the late convocation.[27] Then, after the opening of parliament, he, together with other prominent Puritan divines, sponsored the formulation of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance, and later on, when the document came to be debated in a committee of the house of commons, acted as the clergy's spokesman against the attacks of both Anglicans and Erastians. The unreformed clergyman who, having attended a committee session, declared that "hee had been amongst a companie of rogues that afternoone, who went about to pull downe Episcopacie" and vowed "to pistoll Dr. Burges with his owne hande" may in truth have been "a kinde of distracted man," but he nevertheless had a correct intuition of the importance of Burges in the party organization.[28]

---

[24] The Godly Man's Legacy, pp. 18-19.

[25] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVII (1640-41), p. 74.

[26] Baillie, I, 302-303.

[27] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVII (1640-41), p. 74

Beneath the obvious leadership exercised by Marshall and Burges, the ministers' organization took on a somewhat more shadowy character. Associated with the two party chiefs were a number of important secondary political leaders such as Edmund Calamy, Calybute Downing, and John White. Of this trio, Calamy was doubtless the most influential. His house was the meeting place of the party leadership, and important documents of the clerical organization seem to have been left in his care. After the return of the Independent "exiles" from Holland we must also add the names of Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye to the catalogue of leaders, though in reality their concern was largely confined to the Congregational wing of Puritanism. The leadership of the Puritan clergy was extraordinarily rich, and this catalogue is by no means exhaustive. On the whole, however, the divines seem to have been content to submerge themselves in the organization, confident in the powerful influence which acting in concert gave them.

By 1640 the tradition of ministers' organizations was strong in England. Probably Puritan ministers all over the land had formed themselves into small, informal associations. It was the natural thing to do, and the tradition of the classis movement would have given the tendency an added impulse. Outstripping all the others in importance was the London ministers' organization. Assuming leadership of the clerical campaign shortly before the opening of the Long Parliament, the London organization awakened the attention of the government's spies. "On August 6," read a paper delivered to one of Laud's aids,

---

[28] Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, pp. 369, 379.

> there met about a petition against the oath Dr. Downam, St. Bartholomew-exchange, Dr. Burges, rector of Walthamstow, and lecturer at the bridge foot, Mr. Calamy, Aldermanbury, Mr. Goodwin, Coleman-street, Mr. Jackson, Wood-street, Mr. Browne, Fenchurch-street, who gets signatures and got Dr. Westfield's signature, Mr. Ofspring, St. Antholin's and divers others, they met at Dr. Downam's and got many signatures.[29]

By 1640 the government was disintegrating rapidly enough so that local organizations could take action, and the result of the meeting was that the London Puritan clergy produced a strong petition against the canons of 1640. Burges, as might be expected, was probably the leader of the London group, for it was he that was entrusted with delivering the petition to the king in the north. In its own way, the council also paid tribute to his headship, for it seriously considered ordering his arrest, and warrant was actually given for his house to be searched.[30] Finally, the alarm which the government felt at all this activity of the London organization was in no way allayed by Calybute Downing's "seditious" sermon which was rumored to have been ordered by the party organization to "feele the Pulse of the Citty."[31] It is quite possible that this London organization formed the nucleus of the larger, more inclusive congress of divines which was set up after the opening of the Long Parliament.

---

[29] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVI (1640) (London: Longmans & Co., 1880), p. 564.

[30] Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library, eds. O. Ogle and W.H. Bliss under the direction of H.O. Coxe, I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872), 206; Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVII (1640-41), p. 73.

[31] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 8.

However that may be, it is certain that by the end of 1640 a national, representative body of the Puritan clergy met with some degree of regularity to map out and carry through a common strategy. Without a doubt, this clerical parliament, or "Company of Ministers" as it was apparently called, was the most important production of the Puritan party throughout its history, and represents the highest political consciousness which the Puritan clergy ever attained. The Company had nation-wide representation from the very first, and it was not long before its membership was extended to include all shades of Puritanism. We know that from the very beginning Episcopal Puritans were working with the group, and sometime later after considerable difficulty and "much conference" the Independents were induced to join.[32] The basis of these unions was, as Baillie tells us, "to overthrow the Bishops and Ceremonies, hoping when these _rudera_ are put away, that they shall well agree to build a new house, when the ground is weell sweeped."[33] Thus, the Company equipped itself to represent a united, national, militant Puritanism in the drive against the old church.

That the Company of Ministers actually existed there can be no doubt. D'Ewes, Baillie, and Hacket all make references to actions or decisions of some sort of clerical parliament, though to be sure these references are not always precise. Thus, on one occasion, Hacket complained that Bishop Williams made frequent concessions to the Puritans in the hope of reaching an agreement; yet "when they were among themselves in their own body, they would stand to nothing."[34] We hear of "their own body" again in such casual references as when Baillie tells of the Scots composing tracts "at the desyre of the English ministers"[35] or that "sundrie country ministers" are drawing up a petition.[36] D'Ewes's evidence is even fuller than either of the other two, and on one occasion he gives us a picture of an actual meeting of the Company.[37] But what is only rather vaguely hinted at in these sources becomes starkly clear in Edwards's _Antapologia_. Here, in the course of reproaching the Independents, reference is constantly made to the Company of Ministers, where all the formal business of the clerical estate seems to have been transacted. Sometimes this parliament is referred to somewhat generally as the "meeting among Ministers,"[38] the "meetings of the Ministers,"[39] or the "publique meetings about the matters of Reformation,"[40] but the name which Edwards gives the assembly is the one which we have adopted--the Company of Ministers.

---

[32] Baillie, I, 287. [33] _Ibid_., p. 275.

It is difficult to say just what were the principles that governed membership in the body. Probably these principles were only rudimentary, informal, and elastic. Perhaps any locally important minister visiting London could have a voice in the assembly. We know that at the end of 1641 when the Puritan campaign had already successfully overcome many of its obstacles, Burges deplored the fact that many of the country ministers had left

---

[34] Hacket, Part II, p. 147.

[35] Baillie, I, 292. [36] _Ibid_., p. 282.

[37] _Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament_, pp. 313-314.

[38] Thomas Edwards, _Antapologia: Or, a Full Answer to the Apologeticall Narration_ (London: Ralph Smith, 1644), p. 249.

[39] _Ibid_., p. 242.

[40] _Ibid_., p. 226.

London for their homes.[41] Haphazard as this "representation" may have been, it nevertheless seems clear that the Company was not just a City group and that it had some sort of national scope. We are similarly in the dark as to its exact size. In all likelihood the numbers varied from time to time, and Edwards's use of the term "full meeting" from time to time would tend to confirm this. The only attempt to estimate its numbers comes from D'Ewes, and even he is obviously uncertain. He tells us that the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance was read "in the presence of neere an hundred ministers,"[42] but a little further on, he reports that Burges and Downing informed the commons that the document had been read "in a large roome wheere ther weere about some fowrescore ministers assembled."[43] The difference is not great in any case, and the "large roome" is proof that the number was not small.

The powers which the Company enjoyed were apparently very considerable. It was here that the important alliance between the Presbyterians and Independents was concluded "in a full and great meeting."[44] Moreover, as the agreement stipulated, the alliance was to continue until both parties in a formal session should renounce the pact.[45] The organization was also the judge of all breaches of the agreement, for we learn that "in case one side did transgresse by preaching, &c. none of the other side should take liberty to doe the like, till the company was acquainted with it, and the thing proved."[46] The conclusion and execution of the

---

[41] John Nalson (ed.), An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State, from the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion in the Year MDCXXXIX, to the Murther of King Charles I (London: S. Mearne, T. Dring, B. Tooke, T. Sawbridge, and C. Mearne, 1682), II, 764.

[42] Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, p. 313.

[43] Ibid., p. 314. [44] Edwards, p. 240.

[45] Ibid., p. 239. [46] Ibid.

Presbyterian-Independent alliance was the most important and spectacular work of the Company, but it also seems to have carried on in parliamentary fashion much of the governance of clergy affairs. We hear of "formall Declarations"[47] and of "votes."[48] On one occasion, Edwards becomes indignant at some failing of the Independents, "though at full meetings of the Ministers, they have been spoken unto, and some Ministers have been sent from the Company to some, or one of them."[49] The decisions of the Company were apparently binding, for when two ministers against the ruling of the Company began to ignore the liturgy, they were summoned before the body and "dealt with to take it up againe."[50] What is truly astonishing is that the Company had some sort of weight with the sectaries and tub preachers. The ministers "declared formally their judgement against the practise . . . . at all times" but wisely contented themselves with sending "some of the Company (judged to be most gratious and powerfull with them)" to remonstrate with them.[51]

From time to time we catch sight of small central committees which seem to have carried on much of the executive work of the divines. Though probably created for specific tasks and changed with the occasion, it seems likely that the same men usually served. Thus, when a remonstrance was being appended to the Ministers' Petition, it was "some dozens of hands chosen out of the whole number," as Baillie put it, that drew up the initial form.[52] In very similar language, we are told that when the alliance between the Presbyterians and Independents was cemented, "a Committee was chosen out of the Company, some of them, and some of our side to draw up the particulars in writing."[53] Though a poorer source, Clarendon gives us additional evidence of a select leadership in a rather garbled story of the complaints of some ministers about the handling of their petition to Marshall, "who gave them no other answer but that it was thought fit by those who understood business better than they."[54] About the composition of this leadership we can know very little, though certainly the familiar Puritan leaders were prominent in every undertaking. Marshall, Calamy, and White testified together with four others before the commons on the Ministers' Petition, while Burges and Downing must also have been important in the committee, for though they objected to the length of the paper, they defended it before the house.[55] Whatever preachers comprised this central group, we are told that by 1643 it was meeting at the house of Edmund Calamy where suggestions were received from an over-all Puritan leadership and directions given to the whole body of the clergy. "This is no more," charged Mercurius, "then an Intimation given from the Heads of the Faction, to Calamy and the Iunto that meet at his house from whom their Emissaries receive directions, what concernes the present opportunity, and is necessary to be preached unto the people."[56] And that this statement contains much truth is confirmed by Edwards's assertion that the written Presbyterian-Independent agreement "was left with M.Calamie (at whose house we met)."[57]

---

[47] Ibid., p. 240. [48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., pp. 242-243. [50] Ibid., p. 240.

[51] Ibid., p. 241. [52] Baillie, I, 286.

This Puritan ministers' organization was centered in London, but it had close connections with the Puritan clergy throughout the nation. In part, this connection was cemented by the country representation in the Company, and we know that such important leaders as Stephen Marshall[58] and John White[59] were long absent from their parishes in the shires to attend the Puritan campaign in the capital. What is most astonishing, however, is the evidence of continual contact between the Puritan organization in the City and the ministers in the counties. Thus, shortly after the petition part of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance was completed by the London committee, Baillie reported that it was traversing the countryside for the signatures of Puritan preachers throughout all England.[60] Even more revealing was the close communication evidenced by the remonstrance. In order that the grievances against the old church should be a real expression of the Puritan ministry throughout the county, the remonstrance was based on a large number of separate petitions sent up to the London headquarters. Here some were "entrusted to draw the saied Remonstrance out of those severall petitions" and the resulting synthesis was approved by the whole assembly of divines.[61] Finally, the names of clergy who had signed the shire petitions were attached to the composite remonstrance which was to be presented to the commons.[62] All this indicates not only that the Puritan clergy organization was nation-wide, but that there was a swift, efficient communication and co-operation between the country ministry and the Company.

---

[53] Edwards, p. 241. [54] Clarendon, I, 358.

[55] Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, pp. 313-314.

[56] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 27.

[57] Edwards, p. 241.

---

[58] Alexander Gordon, "Stephen Marshall," DNB, Vol. XII.

[59] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 320.

[60] Baillie, I, 286.

[61] Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, p. 313.

[62] *Ibid*., p. 310.

Although the Company probably claimed to speak for all of the Puritan clergy, it is almost certain that the Presbyterians always remained in control. Its declaration against the sects makes it clear that its Puritanism was of an orthodox complexion. Moreover, the Independents were never completely at home in the assembly. The Company seems to have been constituted prior to their entry into the campaign for reformation, and they were allowed to take seats there only as a result of their signing the engagement for common action. The proprietary manner in which Edwards speaks of the Company in reproaching the Independents is probably indicative of the control which the Presbyterians exercised. "There was a great deale of faire respects to you," he declared, "in admitting you into their Societie, and publique meetings about the matters of Reformation."[63]

Just how long the Company of Ministers lasted is difficult to say. Certainly its most important period was during the first year of the Long Parliament when the Puritan campaign against the old church was at its height. Perhaps it had already begun to decline by December, 1641, when Burges excused the small number of signatures to a petition on the grounds that "many of the Ministers, now against Christmas were gone to their respective Charges."[64] Whether this was actually the case or whether many ministers had concluded that their work in London was largely over and so returned home we shall probably never know. Certainly the Company must have continued until after the Engagement, as the articles of alliance were called, was nullified in "full assembly" as the agreement stipulated. But with the advent of the Westminster Assembly in 1643, it is natural to suppose that the Company was in all important respects superseded by the more important body.

---

[63] Edwards, p. 226. [64] Nalson, II, 764.

Altogether, the circumstances surrounding the framing of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance reveal the very high degree of effectiveness and smooth operation which the party organization of the Puritan ministry had attained. Possessing a competent leadership and the loyal support of the rank and file of the Puritan clergy, the organization could be tremendously influential as the expression of the united Puritan ministry. Moreover, the existence of some sort of deliberative body in London and the very ready communication and exchange with groups of Puritan divines in the shires clearly indicates the national scope of an organized Puritan network. When combined with the growing Puritan control of the pulpit, this network could become one of the greatest forces to exert pressure for the completion of the Puritan Reformation. It is small wonder that Clarendon might say that "this strange wildfire among the people was not so much and so furiously kindled by the breath of the parliament, as of their clergy, who both administered fuel, and blowed the coals in the houses too."[65]

II

No less than the Puritan clergy did the City and the Scots marshall their forces to advance the cause of a Puritan Establishment. The positions of both of these allies were very strong, and the support they could render to the Puritan cause was by no means insignificant. Unlike the ministry, they were not exclusively concerned with the religious aspects of the struggle with the crown and were always deeply involved in the constitutional, political, and economic issues of the quarrel. At the same time, however, the religious problem remained a most important concern of both London and the Scottish representatives.

---

[65] Clarendon, III, 230.

Of the two, London was the more successful in retaining its position of decisive leadership and influence throughout the period of the Long Parliament and the Interregnum. For a while under Cromwell it was eclipsed, but after his death its natural strength reasserted itself and permitted it to play a leading part in effecting the Restoration. London was not yet England to the same extent that it is today, but it was already enjoying a decisive and authoritative position in national affairs. Part of its strength was purely political. As the capital of the realm and the seat of the government, London occupied a position of unquestioned authority, and Englishmen had long grown accustomed to regard it as the controlling center of the nation. Then too, the fact that parliament met at Westminster increased the tendency of the nation, even after the king removed to the north, to wait upon the City for its leadership. The location of parliament at London also made possible a direct influence of great significance, for not only did the parliament men breathe the more radical political and religious atmosphere of the City, but they were subjected to a certain degree of social coercion as well. Members such as Sir Edward Dering testified to the manner in which they were blessed or insulted in the streets according to the way in which they had cast their votes.[66] Oftentimes, moreover, the city's pressure was not so passive, and the London crowds that carried on large demonstrations or that waited in significant numbers outside the parliament became common occurrences throughout the next decade.

---

[66] During his popular period, Sir Edward was happy to receive the plaudits of the crowd. He wrote his wife that "many tooke me by the hand whom I knew not; many said to one another, 'There goes S^{r} Edward Dering,' 'That is S^{r} Edward Dering,' and 'God blesse your worship,' &c." (Proceedings Principally in the County of Kent in Connection with the Parliaments Called in 1640, and Especially with the Committee of Religion Appointed in that Year, ed. Lambert B. Larking ["Camden Society Publications," LXXX (Westminster, 1862)], 47). But after his defection from the party, all this was changed.

Equal to London's predominance as the center of population and government was its commercial might. As the monetary and merchant center of the kingdom, London was the basis of the nation's prosperity. In a more specific sense, it was of tremendous importance as the source of quick loans. In 1640 the financial plight of both sides was very acute since both were in desperate need of money to carry out their undertakings and the tax and revenue systems had broken down. Charles had, on several occasions, made every effort to secure a loan from the City, but the merchant groups were largely in sympathy with the parliamentary cause.[67] "Could Say or Pim, and their beggarly Confederates," cried one bitter Londoner, "have found money to Levie an Army against their Leige Lord, that had not money to pay their owne Debts, had we not furnished them?"[68]

As the clash with Charles became increasingly intense, London's military resources also took on great significance. The great commercial magnates who controlled the City possessed the ships which were to prove so great an advantage to the parliament in the Civil War and were to prevent the king from ever completing his hold on the north and west. Similarly, the best land forces were at the command of the City. The Artillery Company and the London trained bands constituted a large and well-trained force which had frequently been used by the king for various police duties. It was this force that, when the actual fighting began, was the nucleus of the parliamentary army. Prior to the organization of the New Model Army, it constituted the best military resource of the parliament and heroically drove off the king's attack on London at Turnham Green.[69]

---

[67] Gardiner, IX, 26, 39, 98, 130, 136.

[68] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 3.

All these factors made London an exceptionally valuable ally for Puritanism, and that the two actually were in alliance is perfectly clear. That this was the case was due in large measure to the great impression which the Puritan ministers had made on the city's population. It has been said that during the score of years between 1640 and 1660 the city population loyally followed the lead of the clergy in every alteration of the time,[70] and at the beginning of the period the people were, if anything more unanimous on this point than later. The Puritans were especially active in promoting the lectureship system in London, and one of the charges made against the feoffees of impropriations was that they concentrated their attention on London, while other centers, though in much greater need of the light of the gospel, were neglected.[71] The result was that so late as 1646 Baillie, though despairing of the parliament, could declare, "Our last refuge is to God, and under him to the City."[72]

The hold of Puritanism on London was manifested in the Puritan complexion of the City's representatives. Long since, the government had learned to count the members whom the City sent to Westminster as opponents of its ecclesiastical policy, and this was especially true in 1640. Of the five representatives sent up to the house of commons during the early years of the Long Parliament,[73] all save one were zealous adherents of Puritanism. Two of the members had been closely connected with the Puritan venture in New England: Samuel Vassall had carried on an extensive trade with the Puritan colonies,[74] while Matthew Cradock was an ex-governor of the Massachusetts Company.[75] John Venn had a reputation of being the most uncompromising opponent of the Laudian church, and seems to have been closely connected with Burges.[76] Perhaps the most Puritan of all and certainly the most eminent of London's parliament men was Isaac Pennington. As a member of the house and as alderman, Pennington formed a link between the parliament and the City government, and was so successful at uniting the efforts of the two bodies that "'twas a question, which was the Parliament, that at Westminster, or this at Guile-hall."[77] As the friend and parishioner of John Goodwin, rector of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, he had a close personal link with the Puritan ministry, with whom he seems to have worked closely. It is evident that he also kept in touch with the Scottish representatives, and was certainly one of the leading figures behind the City's Root and Branch Petition, which he presented.[78]

---

[69] For background as to the place of London in the Puritan Revolution, see Reginald R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, II (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1894), 92-169.

[70] Hexter, p. 105.

[71] Fuller, Church History, III, 371.

[72] Baillie, II, 337.

What was true of the City's representatives to parliament was also true of the City government itself. Here too, there seems to have been a Puritan group working to fill high offices with men of Puritan stamp. "All care is taken," wrote Mercurius Civicus,

---

[73] London, of course, kept only four members in parliament at a time. John Venn was elected to the commons in June, 1641, after the death of Cradock. Members of Parliament, I, 491.

[74] Bertha Porter, "Samuel Vassall," DNB, Vol. XX.

[75] Sidney Lee, "Matthew Cradock," ibid., Vol. IV.

[76] John Venn, "John Venn," ibid., Vol. XX.

[77] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 22.

[78] Charlotte Fell-Smith, "Sir Isaac Pennington," DNB, Vol. XV.

> to fill the Bench of Aldermen and the Common-Councel, with men disaffected to the Government, both Ecclesiasticall, and Civill. To this purpose if London did not afford men bad enough, they would call them from other Corporations, as Ald. Atkins from Norwich and the like: but if he had seen Amsterdam or had been an Adventurer to New England, or been the host of the silenced Ministers, he was a jewell.[79]

This Puritan domination of the corporation had not been obtained immediately, however. For a time, the royalist lord mayor and aldermen provided a counterbalance to the Puritan forces. But as the mounting radicalism of the times eradicated the vestiges of royal authority and prestige in London, the growing Puritan pre-eminence was reflected in the elections. In the elections of 1641 there was a determined campaign to eliminate those common council men who were loyal to the old church--"men not Zelous for Religion, Ready to comply with the Court for loanes of Monies, and which was worse, many had not only set their hands to, but were active in promoting the intended Petition, for Episcopacy, and the Booke of Common Prayer."[80] The result of the contest was such that by summer of 1642 the Venetian ambassador could inform his government that the leaders of the militia were all Puritans[81] and that the council was "composed of men who are mostly Puritans."[82]

London's Puritanism combined with its great power and influence made it one of the principal resources of Puritan political strength. In many undertakings for the parliamentary cause, the clergy and the London Puritan group seem to have worked hand in hand, and in all probability such co-operation is to be assumed even where it was not readily apparent. Even before the sitting of the Long Parliament, it was evident that there was some sort of concertive action between the City and the London ministry. At exactly the same time in 1640, the City and the Puritan divines of London presented petitions to the king that did much to enfeeble his position and to necessitate the summoning of parliament for a few months later.[83] A little later this common action was also to be seen in the exerting of popular pressure through the excitement of London mobs. The demonstrations by the London mobs were genuine expressions of the City's adherence to the parliamentary party, but this does not mean that they were always entirely spontaneous and unorganized. On the contrary, there is reason to believe that on some occasions they were planned and timed so as to have the greatest possible effect on parliamentary voting and public opinion. Shortly before the parliament was called in 1640, the Southwark riots against Laud took place, and the government examined the leaders of the mob in the attempt to discover what great persons were behind the disturbances.[84] What the council suspected before the opening of the Long Parliament was openly confirmed after that body had begun its sessions. Mob action and demonstrations seem to have been encouraged to support at crucial moments popular causes whose issue was still in doubt. In such cases it was frequently the City preachers who actually produced the gathering by the fire of their preaching and exhortation. We know that somewhat later in the period, the London pulpit succeeded in sending a crowd of five thousand to Westminster.[85] Sometimes Puritan ministers seem to have led such demonstrations, and Cornelius Burges and his associate, the parliament member John Venn, seem to have been especially proficient in this regard. "'Twas usual with him and the said Venn," wrote the antiquary Wood, "to lead up the tumults of the city to the parliament doors to see that the godly party . . . . in the house might not be outvoted."[86]

---

[79] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 4. [80] Ibid., p. 15.

[81] Cal.S.P., Venet., Vol. XXVI (1642-43) (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1925), p. 60.

[82] Ibid., p. 79.

---

[83] Gardiner, IX, 205-206. [84] *Ibid*., p. 141.

[85] Hexter, p. 145.

These constant demonstrations of London's Puritan spirit seem to have been consciously fostered by the city government, especially after the election of Pennington as lord mayor. The City was especially zealous in purging the pulpits of Anglican and royalist sympathizers, in order that the Puritan cause might meet no obstructions from that quarter. The extremely important post at Paul's Cross which traditionally possessed great authority was consigned to Pennington to be filled at his own discretion.[87] The clergy returned Pennington's favors by giving him all the aid in their power, and late in 1642 we find him desiring their assistance in stirring up the parishioners to contribute toward the collection of a much needed £30,000.[88] Hand-in-hand co-operation with the London clergy probably did a great deal to intensify the Puritan character of the City's population, but the government often sought to make London a Puritan metropolis by more direct means. In some cases, suggestions by the City officials seem to have sufficed. Thus, in 1642 when the commons voted the abolition of episcopacy, London's population was genuinely jubilant, but it may be, as Laud believed, that the bell ringing and bonfires "was cunningly ordered to be done by Alderman Pennington, the new Lord Mayor."[89] On other occasions, however, a certain amount of social or even political coercion probably was employed.[90] The result was that by the opening of the Civil War, it could be asserted that all the inhabitants of London were either "real or constrained Roundheads."[91]

---

[86] Wood, III, 682.

[87] The Victoria History of London, ed. William Page, I (London: Constable and Company Limited, 1909), 330.

[88] Discovery of a Great and Wicked Conspiracie against This Kingdome in Generall, and the City of London in Particular (London: Iohn Wright, 1642), unpaged.

[89] Works of William Laud, IV, 10.

III

Like the city of London, the Scots were in 1640 in an extremely strong position to influence the outcome of the English church struggle. Provoked by the introduction of Laudian "popery" into Scotland, the nation rose in revolt and soon sent an invading army across the Tweed into England. Defeated on the field and unsupported at home, Charles quickly attempted to come to an accommodation with the Scots. A temporary agreement was concluded whereby the Scottish army was to remain at Newcastle, while Charles provided for their maintenance to the extent of £850 a day. Meanwhile negotiations for a permanent settlement were taking place, first in Ripon and then later in November of 1640 in London. The success of the northern kingdom in ridding itself of an unwanted church and the abuses of Stuart rule, the inglorious failure of the king and his army, the continued presence of foreign troops on English soil--all these were greatly instrumental in forcing the discredited king to yield to popular pressure at home and summon a parliament. Perhaps the greatest influence driving the king to this expedient was his desperate need of money. Caught between the Scots who demanded funds for their pledge to remain in the north and the City which refused to lend to the crown, Charles had no alternative but to issue writs for a new parliament.

---

[90] See the "Information concerning undue practices by citizens to get signatures to a petition to be presented in the name of the City, to the House of Commons." Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVIII (1641-43) (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1887), p. 193.

[91] Ibid., p. 391.

Thus parliament owed its very existence to the Scots, and it was not blind to the fact that if the king were relieved of his Scottish embarrassments he would not be long in dismissing the houses. Moreover, as time went on and relations between Charles and the legislature became more and more strained, the Scottish army in the north took on the enhanced value of being the only ready military force on which the parliament could count should hostilities break out. As a result, throughout the early years of the Long Parliament, the English parliamentarians were very consciously dependent on the good will of the Scots, and were obliged to treat Scottish suggestions with the fullest amount of consideration and sympathy.[92]

To the benefits which accrued from this high degree of Scottish influence the Puritans in large measure fell heir. Since the days of Cartwright English Puritanism had always retained a sense of kinship with the Scottish church, and the common sufferings under Laud had re-enforced this feeling. As a consequence, the Scottish commissioners who arrived in London late in 1640 came as representatives of triumphant Presbyterianism in the north and were determined to dispose the weight of their influence to the advantage of their Puritan brethren. Occupying a high place among their instructions was the reformation of Church of England by the "godly."[93] To carry out this purpose, a careful campaign was marked out, and three or four of the most able Scots ministers were sent along as propaganda agents.[94] This conscious purpose of the Scottish representatives was soon evident in their actions and gave as much alarm to the Anglicans as it did encouragement to the

---

[92] For an account of Scottish influence at this time in England, see Winthrop S. Hudson, "The Scottish Effort to Presbyterianize the Church of England During the Early Months of the Long Parliament," Church History, VIII (1939), 255-282.

[93] Ibid., p. 257. [94] Baillie, I, 269.

Puritans. Williams vainly attempted to come to some sort of agreement with Alexander Henderson and the other Scottish delegates, but in the end he was obliged to retire, convinced that "their intention was, to shape our Church as ill as their own, to make us as odious to the King as themselves."[95]

Indeed, the Scots were already committed to a pro-Puritan policy, and it seems that some sort of close alliance between the two groups had long been in operation. The high churchmen especially were alarmed at the evidence of collusion between the religiously disaffected of England and Scotland. Laud for one was certain that a league "between the discontented party of both kingdoms, was consulted on in the year 1632,"[96] and by the time of the Scottish Prayer-Book disturbances of 1637, he could write, "No question, but there's a great concurrence between them and the Puritan party in England."[97] These fears, moreover, cannot be wholly attributed to the frightened imaginations of the high churchmen, for more moderate men such as Hacket were no less certain that there was a fully functioning Puritan-Scottish connection. "It was apparent," he declared, "that the Scotch were at one end of the Fray in the North, and the Presbyterians about London at the other end in the South: both confederate to root up, cast down, syndicate, controul, and do what they lust."[98]

Laud's astute suspicion that a union between the Scots and the Puritans had long been consummated, though he confessed "I know not how or by whom," was certainly not without foundation.[99] Shortly after the dismissal of the Short Parliament in May, 1640, the Scottish leaders had established a correspondence with seven of the greatest English peers to attempt to find a basis for common action. The two parties agreed that they suffered from the same enemies and had a common goal--a free parliament to rectify abuses and settle religion. The seven peers were all to be ardent parliamentarians, and three of them--Warwick, Brooke, and Say--were notorious arch-Puritans and leaders of the party.[100] Equally important with this contact between the Scots and the Puritan peers was the earlier mission of the Scottish Presbyterian, Alexander Cunningham, to the Puritan leaders in England. This visit had taken place late in 1639, and Baillie had provided Cunningham with a long list of instructions to guide him while in England. Part of his mission was to obtain interviews with the high churchmen to "see what that faction would be at"; but his principal duty was contained in Baillie's order, "Try who are fervent and able opposits there to Canterburie's way, and let your chief acquaintance be with them."[101] In especial, Cunningham was to seek out such prominent Puritan divines as Samuel Ward of Cambridge; Richard Holdsworth, the master of Emmanuel College; John Prideaux; and Cornelius Burges.[102] Cunningham was also to confer with Independents, Brownists, and "some discreet Alderman" of London, and always his goal was to see "if there be any hope of getting the Episcopall state and their ceremonies removed; at leist, if the Arminian faction, with Canterburie's overthrow, can be gotten crushed."[103] Although we can have no certainty as to how successful Cunningham's mission proved, the fact that Baillie provided him with such definite and far-reaching instructions constitutes indisputable evidence that some sort of combination between the two parties was being energetically advanced. Furthermore, all this evidence takes on even greater significance when we learn that about a half-year later the privy council was informed that Dr. Burges had visited Scotland before presenting to the king the petition of the London clergy.[104]

---

[95] Hacket, Part II, p. 143.

[96] Works of William Laud, III, 299-300.

[97] Ibid., p. 230. [98] Hacket, Part II, p. 141.

[99] Works of William Laud, III, 292.

---

[100] Gardiner, IX, 178-179. [101] Baillie, I, 226.

[102] _Ibid_., pp. 225-228. It is not certain that this is Cornelius Burges. Baillie's words are: "Try for young Dr. Burgesse; it were good his father or he did ansuer Dr. Ames's fresh sute."

[103] _Ibid_., pp. 226-227.

However the alliance between the Scots and the Puritans was effected, it was evident soon after the arrival of the Scottish commissioners in London that such a union did in fact exist. Immediately upon their arrival, the Scots zealously threw themselves into the campaign to pull down the old church, co-operating to the full with all the other elements of the opposition to the crown. To a considerable extent, the Scottish effort at "getting the Episcopall state and their ceremonies removed" was comprised in the negotiations and demands of the commissioners with the members of parliament. As has already been mentioned, the tremendous bargaining power of the commissioners was the most telling contribution which the northern kingdom could make to the Puritan cause. As the relations between parliament and the king steadily deteriorated, the necessity of satisfying the Scots became more and more evident, and finally in the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643 Scottish influence emerged completely though tardily triumphant.

The Scots in London, however, were not content with the mere exploitation of their supreme bargaining position, but sought actively and personally to promote the Puritan efforts. Praying, preaching, and printing were the activities of the Scottish ministers as described by Baillie, and though the effect of the first of these does not lend itself readily to historical analysis, we may be sure that the influence exercised by their preaching and printing was not negligible.[105] "The Commissioners of the Scots," observed the high churchman, Peter Heylyn,

---

[104] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVII (1640-41), p. 74.

> were Complemented, Feasted, and presented by the wanton Citizens; Their Lodgings more frequented for Prayers and Sermons, than the Houses of Foreign Embassadors had ever been for hearing of Mass by any of the English Papists. By means whereof they had the greater opportunity to enflame that City, and make it capable of any impression which they thought fit to imprint upon it.[106]

The Scottish preachers themselves were surprised and delighted at the responsiveness of the London congregations to their sermons. The ministers were assigned to St. Antholin's church, the center of the old Puritan "seminary." There they took turns in preaching, apparently with considerable success, for Baillie reports that "manie a sore thirst getts both men and women thronging in to our sermons."[107] All men were astounded at the great throngs attending the services.[108] According to Clarendon, Sundays brought "so great a herd" that "very many came to and sat in the church from the time that it was light, that they might receive the comfort of those lectures, which were not till the afternoon."[109] That the Scots' sermons, delivered at a critical time and by men that appeared in the dramatic role of deliverers, had a very telling effect cannot be doubted. Something of their influence may be gathered from the reception given one of Baillie's sermons. "I spent much of ane hour," wrote the Scottish divine, "in ane historik narration, the best I could penn, of all that God had done for us, fra the maids commotion in the Cathedrall of Edinburgh to that present day: manie teares of compassion and joy did fall from the eyes of the English."[110]

---

[105] Baillie, I, 299.

[106] Heylyn, Part II, Book V, p. 6.

[107] Baillie, I, 299. [108] *Ibid*., p. 295.

[109] Clarendon, I, 334, n. f.

In a similar manner, the Scots threw themselves into the pamphlet warfare, and considerably strengthened the Puritan forces in that arena. Apparently this practice was not new, for as far back as 1639 the Venetian ambassador had reported that "in order to keep the English Puritans steadfastly in their favour the Scots distribute many papers in this country."[111] The following year when the Scots commissioners left for England, three Scottish ministers were sent along for the sole purpose of carrying on propaganda work, and they were not slow to feed the presses with anti-episcopal tracts.[112] "Think not we live any of us here to be idle," wrote Baillie in reference to the Scots' publishing activities, and then followed the assurance with a short list of tracts "readie for the presse."[113] Usually the Scots posed as English authors to avoid arousing the national resentment against foreign interference in English affairs, and almost invariably the works seem to have been produced in joint consultation with the Puritan divines.

Just as in the publication of tracts, so in all the other phases of the attack on Anglicanism the Scots seem to have worked in harmony with the other elements of the opposition. With the Puritan preachers their relations were most intimate, and one has only to read Baillie to come across a multitude of indications that the Scots and the Puritan clergy were actually one in the conception and execution of schemes to pull down episcopacy. The Scots were also manifestly in league with the City, though here the evidence is not quite so abundant. It is altogether likely, however, that Cunningham had established contact with the London group in 1639, and when the commissioners arrived the following year the City gave them an enthusiastic welcome. Shortly after their arrival, the Scots were visited by "Alderman Penningtoun, with a number of his brether . . . . with some also of the toun-captains, and some from the Inns of Court" who thanked them for the "redemption of their liberties, estates, religion and lyves."[114] Most important, however, was the fact that the Scots usually had full knowledge of the City's most secret plans on religion long before they were openly avowed. Thus, immediately after his arrival in London, Baillie had seen the London Petition against Episcopacy and knew that it was to be delayed until parliament had pulled down some of the "prime bishops."[115] In a similar manner, the Scots had foreknowledge of the anti-episcopal petitions to be presented in the name of the shires[116] and of the City's demand for the conviction of Strafford.[117] Perhaps Digby was aware of this co-operation, for he declared in the commons that the London Petition "had a terrible Tail with it, Sir, and pointed to the North."[118] Lastly, though we can do no more than mention it here, it is important to note that the Scots were in alliance with the Puritan bloc in parliament as well as with the clergy and City. In their official position, the Scots had excellent opportunity to work with the parliament, and this advantage they exploited to the full.[119]

---

[110] Baillie, I, 295.

[111] Cal.S.P., Venet., Vol. XXIV (1636-39), p. 536.

[112] Baillie, I, 269. Apparently each of the three was to specialize in a certain field of the propaganda work. Baillie tells us that it was decided that "Mr. R. Blair, Mr. George Gillespie, and I, should all three, for diverse ends, goe to London: Mr. Robert Blair, to satisfie the mynds of manie in England, who loves the way of New England better than that of Presbytries used in our Church; I, for the convinceing of that praevalent faction, against which I have wryten; Mr. Gillespie, for the crying doune of the English Ceremonies, for which he hes wryten."

[113] Ibid., p. 303.

---

[114] *Ibid.*, p. 288. [115] *Ibid.*, pp. 273-274.

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 280. [117] *Ibid.*, p. 302.

[118] Rushworth, IV, 171.

By means of these alliances which permitted the Scots to work in close harmony with the other elements of the opposition, the peculiar advantages and services which the Scots possessed could be brought to the point of greatest effectiveness. By exploiting their prestige as deliverers, by making full use of their skill in pulpit and press, and by considerable intriguing with the parliament leaders, the Scots were able to achieve remarkable victories in their effort to presbyterianize the Church of England. Though inspired by malice, Heylyn's view of the Scots' activities seems to be accurate: "They were not idle, sollliciting their affairs both openly and underhand, instant in season, and out of season, till they had brought about all ends which invited them hither."[120]

IV

In the final analysis, all the planning and organizing of the Puritans and their allies was directed at winning the support of parliament. Knowing full well that the king was firmly attached to Anglicanism and witnessing the ever increasing growth of parliamentary power, the Puritans would have been obliged to seek the realization of their aspirations in parliament even if they had been otherwise disposed. But a much more fundamental reason was the increasing growth of lay leadership over the old ministerial dominance and the ever closer identification of Puritanism with the middle class, whereby it became more and more the case that the leading adherents of the movement and the chief parliament men were in matter of fact the same people. Thus, the energies of Puritanism and the claims of parliament were necessarily bound together in a unity, and Baillie was expressing a conviction of necessity to all Puritans when he termed the parliament "our sure refuge."[121]

---

[119] Baillie, I, 280, 290.

[120] Heylyn, Part II, Book V, p. 24.

Parliament's attitude toward the Puritan demands was in general one of favor and sympathy, though it must be added that among most members, there were considerations which tended to restrain overzealous and immoderate commitment to the Puritan cause. For in addition to being Puritans, parliament men were generally merchants, gentry, or lawyers as well, and if they had dedicated themselves to the overthrow of the paternal, supervisory Tudor-Stuart state, they were not likely to acknowledge over their affairs the sovereignty of a rigid, religiously commissioned, social ethic. Nevertheless, Puritanism seems to have been sufficiently strong to stamp its character on the whole assembly. Despite the strong Erastian feeling in the houses and the considerable numbers who were bound to Puritanism only by a severe distaste for Laudianism, some allowance must be made for the almost universal contemporary assumption of the Puritan complexion of the parliament.[122]

Standing out from the generally amorphous Puritanism of the parliament are a number of members whose adherence to the movement can be affirmed with greater certainty. To present in detail the constitution of the Puritan group in the Long Parliament, as we have done for Charles's earlier parliaments, is a somewhat lengthy task of only limited rewards and shall not concern us here. Suffice it to say that in the commons the Puritan movement was represented by such men as Sir Robert Harley, John Hampden, Francis Rous, Denzil Holles, and even the great Pym--men that J. H. Hexter has termed the "middle group."[123] In the house of lords as well, Puritanism had its special devotees, and such peers as Warwick, Say and Brooke were all widely known for their loyal patronage of the movement. Throughout the period, however, the lords tended to be far more conservative than the commons, and the Puritan forces found that the chances for a favorable reception as well as the opportunities for presenting their case were usually centered in the lower house.

---

[121] Baillie, I, 285.

[122] According to Hutton, May, the historian of the Long Parliament, even thought that the "constitutional cause of the Commons suffered from the fanatics who would always put religion into the first place in every attack on the government" (William Holden Hutton, The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne [London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1903], p. 73). I have not succeeded in locating this passage in May.

To all elements in parliament, the Puritan forces attempted to direct a constant stream of propaganda and to exert a steady, popular pressure. To accomplish this, several opportunities were open. Direct influence on the parliament could be brought to bear through Puritanism's allies, for both the City and the Scots had more or less official represantation at the houses. The opportunities for the Puritan clergy to impress the legislature were a good deal less patent, for the party organization of the Puritan divines had no official existence, and, except for the fast day sermons, no open platform from which their corporate decisions might be expressed. Yet, though they were obliged to work in secret and through inadequate means, the Puritan ministers nevertheless managed to bring their influence on the houses to a high degree of effectiveness.

The opportunity which London possessed for serving the Puritan cause was dependent in large measure on the intimate connections which the City had with parliament. The City sent four members to the lower house, and in Alderman Pennington it had a representative of major importance both at Westminster and Guildhall. During the first year and a half of the Long Parliament, complete co-operation between London and the parliament was prevented by the continual obstructions of the royalist lord mayor, Sir Richard Gurney. But as time went on, the City government took on a character more representative of the feeling of the population, and after the election of Pennington as lord mayor harmony between London and the parliament seems to have become complete.

---

[123] Hexter, pp. 63-99.

From the very first, the advanced party was eager to use its strength in London for the furtherance of the Puritan cause. For the most part, this meant working hand in hand with the Puritan group in parliament, and we know that Puritan leaders in London sometimes conferred with "friends in both the Houses."[124] But the City also engaged in independent action of its own. Like that of both the Scots and the Puritan ministry, this action was designed to keep up the greatest possible pressure on the members of parliament. One of the most effective means of accomplishing this was bombarding the assembly with petitions and remonstrances. This weapon, which could be very effective when supported by long lists of subscribers and by great crowds of demonstrators, was utilized immediately after the opening of parliament in the celebrated London Petition against Episcopacy and continued to be exploited throughout all the hectic years of the Civil War period. The weight and impact of the petition, moreover, was sometimes artificially re-enforced by means of the close connections which seem to have existed between London and the Puritan elements in the other corporations and in the shires. Thus, it seems quite clear that the London Petition against Episcopacy was only the most important element in a well organized plan to overwhelm the houses with the simultaneous presentation of anti-episcopal petitions from all over the kingdom. Speaking before the lords, the king implied that the country petitions originated in London,[125] and at least one of them--that of Kent--was, as Sir Edward Dering said, if not "the Spawne of the London petition," yet "a Parat taught to speake the syllables of that, and by roate calling for Root and Branch."[126] All this suggests that in proposing reforms to the parliament through the petition, London was able to augment its strength enormously by drawing on its contacts in the country--contacts which were good enough so that the shire petitions could escape the charge of being entirely fraudulent.

---

[124] See, for instance, Baillie, I, 275.

As has already been suggested, however, these formal and legitimate pressures were generously complemented by the support of the London Puritan mobs. The letters of the period are full of references to mob pressure, especially during 1641. "The factious citizens," declared one account, "begin to come again to the House with their swords by their sides, hundreds in companies," while another spoke of the "Roundheaded apprentices" who "flock in troops to the Parliament house" and whose "long ears cannot endure to hear the name of a Bishop."[127] Often, actual intimidation seems to have been used, and we hear of one member who "was strictly examined by them of which side he was in such a manner that with good words, he was glad to slip from them."[128] As was mentioned before, these gatherings were in all likelihood arranged, and we again hear of John Venn "procuring these tumults by saying in Mr. Bradborne's shop in Cheapside, 'You must go to the Parliament with your swords, for that party which is best for the Commonwealth is like to be over-voted.'"[129] Just what effect all these efforts had is difficult to gauge. In one famous case, we do know that the bishops were effectively prevented from taking their seats in the house of lords by the threats of the mob.[130] Certainly all this activity helped to sustain the illusion at Westminster that all England was clamoring for a Puritan church.

---

[125] Great Britain, The Journal of the House of Lords, IV, 142. (Hereafter cited as L.J.)

[126] [Sir Edward Dering], A Collection of Speeches Made by Sir Edward Dering, Knight and Baronet, in Matters of Religion (London: F. Eglesfield and Jo. Stafford, 1642), p. 17.

[127] Trevelyan Papers, eds. Sir Walter Calverley Travelyan and Sir Charles Edward Trevelyan ("Camden Society Publications," CV [Westminster, 1872]), p. 217.

Like the City, the Scots also worked in constant communication with the advanced party in parliament. High churchmen such as Heylyn suspected the union of the two and spoke darkly of a "combination" and of the Scots' "Confederates in both Houses."[131] Though Heylyn's observations were usually colored by a strong bias, he was in this case fairly accurate, for Baillie continually gives evidence of close co-operation between the Scots and the more radical parliament leaders. Frequent references are made in Baillie's letters to "our sure friends,"[132] while the Scots' full foreknowledge of future developments in parliament indicates that the trust and co-operation between the two parties was of a high degree. There must also have been frequent meetings for the planning of joint strategy. Baillie tells us, for instance, that the Scottish articles against Laud and Strafford were drawn up in final form only after "all had perused my two draughts, and our friends in the Lower House considered them."[133] The Scots, moreover, were not content merely to work in concert with the more radical of the parliament leaders but were actively engaged in the attempt to influence the whole body. "Our treaters had a vacation," wrote Baillie on one occasion, "yet they were not idle, bot verie diligent in solisting and informing the members of the Houses."[134]

---

[128] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVIII (1641-43), p. 188.

[129] Ibid. [130] Gardiner, X, 117-118.

[131] Heylyn, Part II, Book V, p. 10.

[132] See, for instance, Baillie, I, 290.

The manner in which the Puritan clergy attempted to bring pressure to bear on parliament was a somewhat different case than that of either the City or the Scots. London had representatives of its own choosing actually in parliament, while the Scottish commissioners in London were official negotiators whose duty it was to confer frequently with many of the lords and who did not find it difficult to discuss matters with the commons leaders. But both because they were clergy and because they were Puritan, the Puritan ministry could only have indirect relations with parliament. As clerics, they were excluded from sitting in parliament since they were supposedly represented in convocation, and as Puritans they were leaders of a semi-illegal, half-outlawed movement which had no official existence within the structure of the established church.

Faced with this situation, the Puritan divines were obliged to exploit such mediums of influence as they had developed in the early years of the reign. In the use of three of these--the sermon, the petition, and correspondence with members--there does not seem to have been an extraordinary degree of change, though certainly they were utilized with far greater confidence and audacity than would have been possible before 1640. In the fast day sermons before the house of commons the Puritan ministers had a platform of primary importance from which to harangue the house, and these sermons became increasingly forthright and direct in their demands for complete loyalty to the cause of God. The petition, too, continued as the most striking way in which the large numbers and solidarity of the Puritan ministry could be represented, and it was with precisely this object that the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance, presented in "the name of the Church," was drawn up.[135] As during the early parliaments of the reign, ministerial counsel delivered in the correspondence of Puritan divines with members was probably an important factor, though here again we have only very slight information as to its extent.

---

[133] _Ibid_., p. 280. [134] _Ibid_., p. 290.

In one of the channels of ministerial contact, however, the clergy's influence on parliament became much more evident. It was indicative both of the increasing radicalism of the times and of the greater freedom which the opposition enjoyed that this should have been personal contact. With some, this association was the fruit of friendship. This was especially evident in the case of the great lords. Robert Rich, earl of Warwick, the patron of Calamy,[136] the protector of Downing,[137] and the host of Marshall,[138] was especially famed for his friendship with the Puritan divines, and his seat in the country was known as "the common Randevouz of all Schysmaticall Preachers."[139] This association with the lords, moreover, gave great promise of actually bearing fruit in parliamentary legislation. After the dissolution of the Short Parliament in May, 1640, the government conducted a search which produced interesting results:

---

[135] Ibid., p. 282.

[136] Charles Harding Firth, "Robert Rich," DNB, Vol. XVI.

[137] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 8.

[138] Stephen Marshall, A Copy of a Letter Written by Mr. Stephen Marshall to a Friend of His in the City for the Necessary Vindication of Himself and His Ministry (London: S. Gellibrand, 1643), p. 1.

[139] A Letter from Mercurius, p. 8.

> Lord Say had divers petitions to have presented in Parliament if it had continued of some grievances of the ministry, given him by silenced ministers . . . . . Lord Brook . . . . had also some petitions to complain of grievances, one being from silenced ministers, to desire there might not be so heavy a hand carried over them.[140]

Similarly, there were certainly many like friendships in the commons. The associations of Venn with Burges and of Pennington with Goodwin have already been mentioned. Other parliament men such as D'Ewes, Harley, Dering, Holles, and even Pym gave constant evidence of association with prominent Puritan divines, while the readiness of certain members to notify the preachers for the fast days probably constitutes additional evidence.[141] Here again Marshall seems to have outdistanced all his colleagues. "In the late long lasting parliament," wrote Fuller,

> no man was more gracious with the principal members thereof. He was their trumpet, by whom they sounded their solemn fasts, preaching more public sermons on that occasion, than any four of his function. In their sickness he was their confessor; in their assembly their counsellor; in their treaties their chaplain; in their disputations, their champion.[142]

The new tendency of the Puritan ministers to work overtly and boldly in close personal association with parliament members was displayed from the very beginning. In the critical election contests for seats in the Short Parliament, Puritan ministers seem to have used their pulpits to good effect. As might be expected, Stephen Marshall was one of the principal offenders in this regard, and an Essex royalist complained that "those ministers who voted for the earl of Warwick, as Mr. Marshall, and others, preached often out of their parishes before the election."[143] Nor was Marshall's intervention a single example, for in addition to his fellow ministers of Essex, we hear of similar electioneering activity by eleven Puritan preachers in Gloucestershire. "Those who first rolled this unwilling stone," went the bitter report of an Anglican divine, "were principally men of our own coat, a pack of either deprived, silenced, or puritanically affected men."[144]

---

[140] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVI (1640), p. 153.

[141] See, for instance, the entry for December 17, 1641: "Sir Rob. Harley has undertaken to give Mr. Calamy notice; and Sir Tho. Barrington--Mr. Marshall." C.J., II, 348.

[142] Fuller, Worthies, II, 105.

The co-operation begun thus early became ever more common as the sessions of the Long Parliament continued. To some extent, an excuse for personally championing the Puritan cause before members was provided by the circumstances surrounding the presentation and discussion of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance. Sir Robert Harley was attended by sixteen of the "eldest and gravest" divines when he presented the petition,[145] and when it was attacked by Digby, some seven of the clergy's leaders appeared before the bar in its defence.[146] Perhaps most important of all was the presence of the ministers at the committee meetings where Burges and his colleagues were given full freedom to speak in defence of their petition. The persuasive power of the sixteen ministers was apparently of no little importance, for Baillie wrote that "the Ministers, by their Speaker, Dr. Burgesse, gave to the Committee full contentment, and so much the greater by my Lord Digbie and Mr. Selden's frequent opposition."[147]

---

[143] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XV (1639-40), p. 609.

[144] Ibid., Vol. XVII (1640-41), p. 582.

[145] Baillie, I, 291-292.

[146] Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, p. 314.

[147] Baillie, I, 307-308.

Probably, however, the most important channel of the ministers' personal influence was the unofficial, more or less intentionally concealed, behind-the-scenes contacts. A considerable number of Puritan ministers were customarily in evidence near the parliament, partly to keep themselves informed, partly to exhort flagging members, and partly to take counsel with the party leaders in the houses. Some indication of the strict watch they kept is given in an incident recounted by Sir Simonds D'Ewes. Thinking that the bill against episcopacy was not to be debated that day, D'Ewes tells us that he left the chamber and was walking near the court of common pleas when "Mr. Stephen Marshall, minister of Finchingfield, came to me and asked me how chance I was not in the House, and desired me to make haste thither, because they were in agitation about this great business for abolishing bishops."[148] D'Ewes's experience was seemingly not at all unusual, for Sir Edward Dering spoke bitterly of "the usuall blacke walkers in Westminster Hall."[149] One of them catechized him in plain terms: "Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?"[150] Sir Edward's vacillating policy must have strongly provoked the Puritan clergy, for immediately afterward, he complained, "Another or our Parliament-pressing Ministers, after I had delivered by sence upon Episcopacy in the House, came to me and told me plainely, That my conscience was not so good as in the beginning of the Parliament."[151] Moreover, the growing enmity between Presbyterians and Independents seems to have produced a bitter competition between the rival lobbies at Westminster. In a tract which appeared in 1641, Edwards took the Independents to task for "daily attending at Westminster" and "insinuating themselves into the company of sundry Members of the House of Commons,"[152] though he was certainly aware that the Presbyterians were no less guilty. In the same year a temporary peace was concluded between the two parties in which both sides undertook not to intrigue with parliament men,[153] but, if we can believe Edwards, the condition was not lived up to. Constantly he accuses the Independents of "tampering" with the members. In one fine passage of bitter irony, he reveals the accepted techniques of religious politics:

---

[148] William A. Shaw, A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900), I, 82, quoting D'Ewes, Diary, III, 1014.

[149] Dering, p. 2. [150] Ibid. [151] Ibid.

> So you have not by other wayes and meanes acted for your selves or way: as in making friends, or in mooving any Parliament men, or in consulting together what to doe about your way; no, alas good men, you have kept your houses close, and followed your studies hard, and seldome gone to Westminster, but have left the business of Independencie and the Church-way to God wholly, leaving him to take care of his own way and cause. Brethren, how dare you write thus?[154]

Most of this rival lobbying, however, probably belongs to a somewhat later period, and it is reasonable to suppose that during the early months of the Long Parliament most of the ministers' personal influence went toward the destruction of the old church.

Thus, by all these various means, the Puritan ministry, the Scots, and the city of London attempted to accomplish the two-fold task of working in concert with the Puritan group in parliament and of bringing the weight of their influence to bear on those members who were not yet committed to the Puritan cause. But to pursue one by one the lobbying activities of these divisions is to nourish an abstraction that did not in fact exist. In dealing with either the ministry or the City, the Scots or the parliament, one is constantly impressed with the fact that all elements seem to be operating as a single unit. Time and again, Baillie tells us what move the party has planned next, regardless of whether it is to emanate from parliament, ministry, City, or the Scots themselves. Occasionally too, we get glimpses of the party unity as when members such as D'Ewes rise in the house to give us an account, unwittingly of course, of the more or less clandestine activities of the clergy.[155] And if D'Ewes was privy to the affairs of the clergy, the reverse was also true, for on one occasion he registers his irritation that Stephen Marshall give him but short notice that he must speak in the house that day for the abolition of episcopacy.[156] Perhaps the most striking instance of this kind is where Baillie, a Scot, tells us that the London Petition against Episcopacy, a document almost certainly drawn up with the aid or countenance of the ministry, is being temporarily withheld from parliament on the advice of the Puritan members.[157]

---

[152] Thomas Edwards, Reasons against the Independent Government of Particular Congregations: as also against the Toleration of Such Churches to Be Erected in This Kingdome (London: Jo. Bellamie, and Ralph Smith, 1641), "The Introduction," unpaged.

[153] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 241.

[154] Ibid., pp. 220-221.

To harmonize all these efforts some sort of unified command would seem to have existed. We everywhere perceive the results of its workings, and the statement of Mercurius about the clergy receiving intimations from the heads of the faction would certainly substantiate this conclusion. Yet only on one occasion does the seat of this unity actually come before our view. With regard to the introduction of the Root and Branch Bill into the commons, D'Ewes noted in his diary that "Sir Robert Harley, as I gathered, Mr. Pym, Mr. Hampden, and others, with Stephen Marshall, parson of Finchingfield, in Essex, and some others had met yesternight and appointed that this bill should be proceeded withal this morning."[159] It is perhaps dangerous to regard this body as either permanent or as possessing formal organization, but it is not too extravagant to conclude that from time to time the leading representatives of all the groups of Puritan supporters came together to work out campaigns for the future. Certainly there was nothing dictatorial about the organization, and co-operation between all the units was not always perfect. Thus, in the case of the City's petition against episcopacy, the Londoners could no longer be restrained with the result that the petition was handed in prematurely. On the whole, however, the harmony of action which was attained was much more in evidence than the failings.

---

[155] Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, pp. 310, 313.

[156] Shaw, I, 82, quoting D'Ewes, Diary, III, 1014.

[157] Baillie, I, 275.

Bishop Williams, who could at times be highly observant, noted all these sources of Puritan strength as soon as he entered into the work of parliament after his release from prison. "He had not been many hours there," wrote his biographer, "when he was amazed to see divers composed of new and strong Passions: instigated to boldness by Scotch Confederacy; heightened up by the Petitions and Mutinies of City and Country; and preach't into disorder by Presbyterian Divines."[159] Shrewd as Williams's enumeration was, it was not complete. For, to a large extent, the triumph of the Puritan forces was due to the unity of Puritanism and the sufferance of the English middle class. And time was to show that the Puritanism of 1640 was divisive and that the middle classes, though they might contain a strong and even sincere urge toward Puritanism, were to declare themselves unmistakably for a "safe"

---

[158] Shaw, I, 81-82, quoting D'Ewes, Diary, II, 692.

[159] Hacket, Part II, p. 139.

Erastian Establishment, where the dangers of clerical supervision could never again rise to trouble them.

CHAPTER VII

TRIUMPH OF THE PARTY:
THE RELIGIOUS REVOLUTION

I

At long last the time was ripe for a Puritan reformation. For over three-quarters of a century the Puritan movement, despite official repression, had been steadily gaining ground, and by the opening of the Long Parliament it was the most vital and aggressive religious force in England. But in addition to its own inherent strength, Puritanism was in a position to capitalize on the deep and widespread reaction which Laud's unwise policy of "thorough" had evoked throughout the land. As a result of the very general revulsion against the rule of the Anglo-Catholic hierarchy, it was inevitable that some sort of reformation would quickly follow the assertion of parliamentary authority. The hatred of the bishops was so bitter and so pervaded all types and classes of men that the reform movement produced something close to a national and unanimous exultation. "Hudge things are here in working," rejoiced Baillie on his arrival in London. "The mighty hand of God be about this great work! We hope this shall be the joyfull harvest of the teares that thir manie yeares hes been fawin in thir kingdomes."[1] And this was a fairly faithful representation of the spirit which dominated the early days of the great parliament.

Yet the demand for reformation, general as it was, represented a host of variant and even conflicting sentiments which were united only for the moment in the face of the common foe. With some, the demand for ecclesiastical reform seems to have been only a by-product of the constitutional struggle, and though the representatives of this view were determined that the clergy should be rendered politically innocuous, they felt the claims of religion rather lightly. In others a strong lay spirit was combined with genuine religious feeling so that in a few months' time when religious divisions became irreconcilable, Anglican and Puritan Erastians appeared in each camp. Even the Puritans themselves were becoming hopelessly divided--a fact which was to emerge ever more prominently as the revolution advanced.

---

[1] Baillie, I, 274.

All these elements in the national consciousness were reflected in the constitution of the houses when parliament assembled in November of 1640. First of all, there was the distinction between constitutional and religious interests. In many of the members these two causes blended inextricably, but the distinction was real enough to be discerned by contemporaries. The complexity of the motivations which impelled the parliament men to support reform was astutely drawn in a brilliant passage of Baxter's:

> The Concord of this Parliament consisted not in the Unanimity of the Persons (for they were of several Tempers as to Matters of Religion), but in the Complication of the Interest of those Causes which they severally did most concern themselves in . . . . the Parliament consisted of two sorts of men, who by the Conjunction of these Causes were united in their Votes and Endeavours for a Reformation: One Party made no great matter of these Alterations in the Church; but they said, That if Parliaments were once down, and our Propriety gone, and Arbitrary Government set up, and Law subjected to the Prince's Will, we were then all Slaves . . . . These the People called Good Commonwealth's Men. The other sort were the more Religious Men, who were also sensible of all these things, but were much more sensible of the Interest of Religion . . . . . But because these later agreed with the former in the Vindication of the Peoples Propriety and Liberties, the former did the easilier concur with them against the Proceedings of the Bishops and High Commission Court.[2]

---

[2] Reliquiae Baxterianae, Part I, p. 18.

This division between the "Good Commonwealth's Men" and the "more Religious Men" was no new development, and it had long been recognized that religious grievances were only one--though that one the most spectacular--of the several elements which made up the opposition in the Stuart parliaments.

Moreover, even among those members that bore the stamp of Puritanism, there was considerable divergence of opinion. Some few, perhaps, were sympathetic to the idea of a strong, highly clerical Puritan Establishment such as the Puritan clergy on the whole desired, but a much larger number were to show themselves in favor of a Puritan church which would be dominated by the lay influence and docile to parliamentary control. A more immediate variance which appeared among the parliament men, however, was the lack of unanimity with which they approached the problem of the treatment of the old church. Although we tread on rather unsure ground here, there is little evidence that the members were greatly influenced by the theological divisions already so prominent among the clergy. For the most part, Puritan members seem to have been broadly Puritan without reference to the specific forms into which the movement was shortly to divide. They were divided, however, by the degree of ardor and radicalism with which they threw themselves into the task of reformation. In addition to the conservative Episcopal grouping and the intransigent root-and-branch men, there were a great number of centrists or moderates --Pym himself was apparently one of them[3]--who were willing to stop short of root-and-branch if by so doing they could secure and consolidate their constitutional reforms. Although for the moment all these gradations of opinion among the Puritan parliament men were submerged in the unanimous condemnation of the hierarchy, it was inevitable that differences should soon appear on the scene and considerably retard and obstruct the triumph of the reformation. Perhaps had the parliament been left to itself, its inner disharmony would have become so great that only minor reforms could have been obtained.

---

[3] According to one contemporary, Pym is supposed to have said that the intention of the house was to reform, not abolish, episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer (Shaw, I, 38-39, citing Bagshaw, Just. Vindicat., British Museum, E. 1019). For one treatment of Pym's religious views, see Hexter, pp. 200-201.

But the fact was that parliament was not permitted to work out a reformation for England by itself. Outside the houses were a number of interested pressure groups which vociferously demanded a voice in the shaping of the new Israel. By far the most powerful of these groups were united in that complex of clergy, the City, the Scots, and their parliamentary allies that we have called the Puritan party. In large part the history of the Puritan Reformation in England is a narration of the tension produced in the relations of the Puritan party, determined, zealous, and single-minded and a house of commons, preoccupied with carrying on a tremendous revolution and distracted by the constantly shifting alignments of Long Parliament politics.

It is almost needless to say that the necessity of working through such a parliament constituted a distinct hardship for the Puritan party. To be sure, there was one compensation: the reformation was being imposed authoritatively from above. Gravely distrusting the democracy, the Puritan clergy had always hoped for a godly prince until reality forced them to transfer their hopes to the parliament. "It was the happiness of England," Calamy told the commons in 1642,

> that in her first reformation she was acted by authority: Our reformation began from the head, and not from the feet: And it is now no little blessing, That this second reformation

> beginnes from the heads of our Tribes in the old and good way of a Parliament, and not by a popular tumult.[4]

Yet this advantage could not disguise the fact that a parliamentary reformation was dangerous to the party. On the one hand, the very manner of the reformation, the very fact of permitting the legislature to alter the entire ecclesiastical structure of the kingdom manifestly contained within it the deadly seeds of Erastianism. For the moment, however, this consideration was not acutely felt. But the other disadvantage was constantly experienced: the irksome and trying necessity of adopting the attitude of humble petitioners to the parliament for reforms which often came only slowly and grudgingly, and were constantly being modified by external considerations. Moreover, there seems to have been an attitude on the part of the members--though seldom expressed during the early years--that the clergy were only a special interest group and they would do well to submit to whatever reformation the nation's representatives considered best for the country.

Yet on the whole, the party refused to submit to this pattern of carrying out the reformation. This was especially apparent with regard to the clergy. The City and the Scots had a voice through their official representatives, but the Puritan ministers of 1640-42, unlike the Scottish clergy or the later Westminister divines, were without any recognized organization which could authoritatively speak in the name of the church. Yet despite this disadvantageous situation, the Puritan divines were stubborn in demanding that God's prophets should be consulted in religious matters. This insistence was expressed unequivocably before the commons in a number of fast day sermons. On one occasion, Calamy noted that in the Old Testament "when God raised up

---

[4] Edmund Calamy, God's Free Mercy to England (London: Christopher Meredith, 1642), p. 7.

Magistrates . . . . to pity Sion that lay in the dust, and to repaire her breaches: at the same time he raised up Prophets also . . . . to strengthen the hands of the Magistrates, and to encourage them in so noble a service."[5] And Marshall was even more emphatic in his insistence on the essential parity of "Magistrates and Ministers, whom God hath invested with his owne authoritie, and . . . . put his sword into their hands, and armes them with power to keep sin in, and beat it downe; The Magistrate having the sword of Iustice . . . . and Ministers having the sword of the Spirit."[6] These claims were not idle pretensions to impossible positions of influence, but a fair description of what the clergy were on the verge of achieving through the control of the pulpit and through their well developed ministers' organization.

The English Puritan Reformation, then, was marked by two characteristics. On the one hand, the revulsion felt at the excesses of Laudianism was so universal that a reformation along the lines of Puritanism or at least of Reformed Protestantism was a foregone conclusion. Yet precisely because of the universality of the anti-Laudian forces, the reform sentiment contained within it such a high degree of disunity that it was not long before the multiplicity of forces and counterforces within the parliamentary party began to act in such a manner as to bind internally the impulse toward reformation. The result was the second factor: that despite all the efforts of the radical Puritan party both without and within parliament, the reformation issued only slowly and with a great deal of travail and effort. Still the reformation--or at least its negative aspect, i.e., the eradication of Anglicanism--was achieved. But when it came to building the new Establishment --the positive reformation--so large a part of the original church reform forces were opposed to Presbyterianism that the whole movement began to halt and stumble. The negative reformation had been achieved only with the greatest of difficulty; the positive reformation was destined never to be really achieved at all.

---

[5] Edmund Calamy, Englands Looking-glasse Presented in a Sermon Preached Before the Honourable House of Commons, at Their Late Solemne Fast, December 22, 1641 (London: C. Greene, 1642), "Preface," unpaged.

[6] Stephen Marshall, Reformation and Desolation: Or a Sermon Tending to the Discovery of the Symptomes of a People to Whom God Will by No Means Be Reconciled (London: Samuel Gelibrand, 1642), p. 38.

II

The destruction of the old church was a gradual and piecemeal affair, and its official consummation did not take place until after the beginning of the Civil War. Yet by the end of 1641 the work of the Puritan campaign had largely been completed, and the clerical leaders were turning their attention to the far more difficult demands of the positive reformation. Even so, the complete victory over Anglicanism was not won easily. The first optimism with the progress of the reformation soon gave way to more sober appraisals as Anglican opposition began to raise obstructions. The Church of England, it soon became apparent, was not to be taken in direct assault, and the party was forced to sit down to a long, slow siege and concentrate on capturing the enemy strongholds one by one.

During the first few weeks of parliament, the situation was not yet well crystallized. The party leaders, perhaps, had some plan well in mind, but no action had yet been taken, and there was probably some disposition to feel the situation out before acting. This early uncertainty and ambiguity of Puritan policy was manifested in the fast day sermons of Stephen Marshall and Cornelius Burges.[7] Early in the session, the parliament had asked the king for a fast, and as a consequence the clergy's first public pronouncement was heard on November 17.[8] The sermons which were preached from the London pulpits on that day were apparently more than ordinarily radical. The Venetian ambassador termed them "seditious,"[9] and even Baillie was astonished.[10] But the sermons before the commons, though strongly worded, were far less radical. For the most part, the addresses were devoted to the usual exhortations. The inevitable demands were made for the establishment of an "able, Godly, faithful, zealous, profitable Preaching Ministery, in every Parish Church and Chappell throughout England and Wales" and for a zealous magistracy "to be ever at hand to back such a Ministery."[11] Arminianism, the persecution of godly ministers, the dishonor of the Sabbath--all were condemned together with a demand that the high churchmen be punished.[12]

But despite this general tone to the complaints, the ministers allowed hints of a more radical policy to emerge from time to time. Warnings were uttered against the moderates who fancied themselves secure with the abolition of the "many Pressures of

---

[7] Cornelius Burges, A Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons Assembled in Parliament. at their Pvbliqve Fast, Novem. 17. 1640 (London: P. Stephens and C. Meredith, 1641); Stephen Marshall, A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons, now Assembled in Parliament, at Their Publike Fast, November 17, 1640 (London: Samuel Man, 1641).

[8] C.J., II, 23-24; Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, p. 18.

[9] Cal.S.P., Venet., Vol. XXV (1640-42) (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1924), p. 97.

[10] Baillie, I, 273.

[11] Burges, "The Epistle Dedicatory," unpaged; Marshall, A Sermon Preached to the Commons, "The Epistle Dedicatory," unpaged.

[12] Marshall, A Sermon Preached to the Commons, pp. 32-34.

Church and State"[13] and veiled references were made to a jus divinum for some undefined New Testament polity. "Down at once," stormed Burges, "with all inventions and fancies of men, which corrupt and adulterate the pure worship of God. Let none but He be worshipped, and let no worship be thrust upon him which himselfe hath not prescribed."[14] And Marshall was even more emphatic. "Bee yee purgers and preservers of our Religion," was his charge. "Look thoroughly what is amisse, and pluck up every plant that God hath not planted; throw to the Moales and to the Bats, every rag that hath not Gods stamp and name upon it."[15]

The existence of these two elements side by side in the sermons indicated a certain unwillingness to be committed to any definite policy as yet. It was clear that the high churchmen were to be punished, that clergy of unworthy life and unsound doctrine were to be purged, and that the character of Anglicanism was to be radically altered. Yet there was no insistence that Anglicanism be supplanted, and even in the demands for a divinely ordained service and polity the possibility of a reformed episcopacy was evident. In the last analysis, Burges and Marshall seem to have used strong language without suggesting any definite action except in hints.

This uncertainty and non-committal feeling was also manifested in the Puritan attitude toward convocation. Evidently there was some temptation to take over that body and to use it as an instrument of reformation. Some Puritan ministers, at any rate, were concerned with getting a Puritan party seated in convocation, for Stanley Gower, the Puritan preacher at Brampton Bryan, forwarded a petition to the house against the devices used to prevent the election of Puritan divines.[16] According to Baillie, the body actually did contain a considerable number of reformers. "Some thirtie of them," he declared, were "weell minded for removing of Episcopacie, and monie moe for pairing of Bishops nailles, and armes too."[17] There was even a movement that "they should endeavour . . . . to prevent their Adversaries intention by condemning such offensive Canons as were made in the last Convocation."[18] The opportunity to capture an official platform for their views must have been inviting to the Puritan clergy, but apparently they also perceived that not only would the Anglican opposition in convocation be powerful but also that the body was so integral a part of the old system that its use would have compromised the whole root-and-branch program. The result was that the ministers abandoned the opportunity and chose to work more or less clandestinely with the other elements of the party in applying pressure on the parliament.

---

[13] Burges, p. 31. [14] Ibid., p. 52.

[15] Marshall, A Sermon Preached to the Commons, p. 40.

Yet despite this hesitancy to declare themselves, the Puritan ministers seem to have settled on the goal of root-and-branch from the very first.[19] There has been a good deal of confusion on this point since the party was later obliged to reshape its strategy and assume the guise of moderation. But though there may have been some uncertainty among the followers of the movement, the Puritan leaders seem to have known where they were going. In convocation and in Bishop Williams's committee they had ample opportunity to implement a moderate reform program with the aid of the moderate Anglicans. Their failure to seize upon these opportunities plus their close co-operation with the Presbyterian Baillie would seem to indicate that there was little zeal for the cause of moderate reform among the important Puritan leadership. This conclusion is given a signal confirmation by Thomas Edwards. The Independents in 1643 charged the Presbyterians with having had great differences among themselves three years back, referring apparently to the nebulous undenominationalism which characterized the movement immediately after the opening of the Long Parliament.[20] Edwards, however, was able to reply that "might they have had their desire, and could their votes have carried it," the ministers "would have voted out Ceremonies, government by Arch-bishops, and Bishops, &c. this Lyturgie and Service-book."[21] To be sure, there were a number of Episcopal Puritans who did not share the predominant admiration for Presbyterianism, but some of these seem to have been placated by the presumed moderation of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance, while others conceived of root-and-branch not as an end but as a means to the erection of the new godly episcopacy. Thus, there seems to have been considerable unanimity within the Puritan forces behind the root-and-branch program.

---

[16] Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report 14, Appendix, Part 2, III, 69-70.

[17] Baillie, I, 282.

[18] Heylyn, Part II, Book V, p. 8.

[19] Shaw, I, 7. Yet since he regards the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance as genuinely moderate, he apparently would not include the Puritan ministers in the root-and-branch party.

Before the middle of December, however, this period of "watchful waiting" was terminated by the appearance of the first full-scale reformation proposal from any quarter--the London Petition against Episcopacy. Perhaps even before the parliament met in November, the leaders of the root-and-branch elements in London had determined on a sweeping attack on the Anglican system by means of a flood of petitions directed to the house. Overshadowing all the rest, of course, was the London petition itself which quickly became known as the celebrated Root and Branch Petition. Seemingly, there is no direct evidence which connects the Puritan clergy with this document, but the active manoeuvering of the clergy's organization in London and Baillie's very evident intimacy and foreknowledge of the movement would indicate that the clergy were not innocent of some connection with the scheme. At any rate, on November 18 Baillie informed his wife in Scotland that "the Toun of London, and a world of men, minds to present a petition, which I have seen, for the abolition of Bishops, Deanes, and all their aperteanances." Baillie then went on to say that in spite of the impatience of the city, it was determined to postpone the presentation of the petition until after the fall of Canterbury and the most criminal of the bishops.[22]

---

[20] Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Sidrach Simpson, Jeremiah Burroughes, and William Bridge, An Apologeticall Narration, Humbly Submitted to the Honourable Houses of Parliament (London: Robert Dawlman, 1643), p. 15. (Hereafter cited as Apologeticall Narration.)

[21] Edwards, Anatpologia, p. 270.

It seems almost certain, moreover, that the postponement was also dictated by the necessity of presenting simultaneously the anti-episcopal petitions from the shires. Baillie, at the time of the presentation of the London paper, spoke with certainty of the expected arrival of the petitions from the country. By Thursday next, he wrote, "sundrie petitions of severall shyres, to everie one whereof some thousands of hands are put, will be given in against Episcopacie: God speed all weell."[23] And as a matter of fact, in the next month thirteen county petitions were presented to the house within twelve days,[24] "all which petitions tending to the abolishing of the Bishopps with ther hierarchicall goverment."[25] This in itself is a suspicious harmony, and indeed there is grave doubt as to the freedom and spontaneity of the country petitions. Accusations were made that the petitions originated in London,[26] and in the only one about which we know very much--that of Kent--the text of the London petition was reproduced almost exactly.[27] It is possible that these petitions were entirely fraudulent, but the feeling against Laudianism was so strong at this date that it seems much more probable that similar, if not identical, petitions were drawn up simultaneously and then farmed out to the counties where great numbers of men would be willing to attach their names to any document represented as anti-hierarchical.

---

[22] Baillie, I, 273.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

Yet if the intention of the promoters of this root-and-branch effort was to force quick radical action on the church question by means of this stratagem, their effort met with failure. Doubtless, the failure was due partially to the undisciplined execution of the plan. The London leaders attempted to defer the presentation of the City petition to a more favorable moment, but, as Baillie explained, "the people's patience could no longer [keep] in."[28] As a result, on December 11, the petition was prematurely delivered to the house by the two aldermen members for London.[29] But more significant than this poor management was the unexpected and surprisingly determined opposition which the proposal evoked. For the first time, the commons was seriously split on an important question. "There were many against, many for the same," wrote the Scottish commissioners.[30] And as time went on, this division became more pronounced. By February 8, when there was a great debate on the petition, the nucleus of a determined episcopal party had already emerged.[31]

---

[24] C.J., II, 67, 73; Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, pp. 249, 282-283.

[25] Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, pp. 282-283.

[26] L.J., IV, 142.

[27] In a letter sent along with the petition, the petitioners admitted as much: "In all due respect, these are to intimate unto youe, that, hearing of late of a certeyne petition which was, with good advise and deliberacion of divers cittizens of London . . . . drawne and composed, and by them intended to be exhibited to the Commons howse of Parliament; and, desirous to have a veiw of a Copye thereof, by the helpe of some freinds, obteyned it, and approving thereof, thought fitt to make knowne the same in this county of Kent" (Proceedings in Kent, p. 25).

It was apparently this initial repulse that dictated a change in tactics of the Puritan party. The unexpected vigor of Anglicanism plus the high popularity of the ideal of reformed episcopacy seems to have forced the party to revise its strategy so as to adopt the new method of pulling down the old church stone by stone.[32] Thus it was that when the Puritan clergy prepared to deliver a petition of their own to the house, a new tone of severity coupled with moderation was struck. At the same time, the unexpected strength of the aroused episcopal sentiment displayed the necessity for the several Puritan factions to forget their differences and close ranks in a united front. These two principles, the strategy of moderation and the achievement of unity, were the engines of reformation. They soon found expression in the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance and the Engagement.

---

[28] Baillie, I, 280.

[29] C.J., II, 49; Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, pp. 138-141.

[30] Gardiner, IX, 247.

[31] Baillie, I, 302; Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, pp. 335-338.

[32] Though this explanation cannot be stated for certain, it is reasonable conjecture. Several other explanations are possible. The London Petition might have been presented merely to frighten conservatives and make the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance look conservative. Or perhaps it had been determined to present both petitions and then follow whichever seemed to offer the greatest promise. Perhaps even the two petitions are to be explained by the fact London seems to have been almost unanimous in its religious radicalism, while the large Episcopal Puritan element among the clergy necessitated some concession in their direction. The manner in which the Ministers' Petition was drawn up leaves open the possibility that its demands were altered between December 11 and January 23.

III

The new order of the day was moderation--or at least the appearance of moderation. To be sure, the campaign against the prominent Anglo-Catholics and the abuses of the Laudian regime went on with unabated vigor. But toward those aspects of the Anglican system which were not innovations but which, on the contrary, were basic to the historic Church of England--namely, the liturgy and episcopacy--the Puritan leaders displayed admirable restraint. While never definitely committing themselves to a moderate position, they nevertheless contrived to give the impression that a reformation within the limits of the old church was still possible.

Yet it seems likely that this "moderation" was merely a stratagem to retain the adherence of the considerable numbers of the Episcopal Puritans and to take the edge off the resistance of the Anglican party. The Puritan leaders seem to have acted with very little sincerity in their new roles, for plans for the overthrow of the old Establishment were already decided upon. As early as December 28, 1640, Baillie could state authoritatively that the English "have much to doe: the displanting of the Court, the overthrow of Episcopacie, the planting of the Court, the setleing of a new government in the Church."[33] It would seem, moreover, that the shape of the new government had already been worked out with some care by all the elements in the Puritan party. The clergy, wrote Baillie, "will draw up a modell of their own, with our advyce, to be considered upon by Commissioners of the Church, and others appoynted by Parliament, and, if God shall bless this land, by these Commissioners to be settled in everie congregation at this extraordinarie tyme, till afterward, the Church being constitute, a Generall Assemblie may be called to perfyte."[34] Perhaps the Scot was too optimistic, but he felt confident that this interim government would be quasi-Presbyterian in form. A short time later, he tells us that part of the future program of the commons was "to erect presbytries in all the land."[35] To be sure, this plan was only a stop-gap until the "Generall Assemblie"--the Westminster Assembly--could meet for the definitive settlement, but it shows that the Puritan ministry together with the Scots and the root-and-branch element in the commons had developed a complete program which ideally had no place in it for Anglicanism, however modified and reformed.

---

[33] Baillie, I, 285.

This flank attack was highly successful for a time and speaks well of the political astuteness of the Puritan managers. By limiting their attacks to the less essential elements of the ecclesiastical constitution, they were able to pose as the champions of legitimate reform and place their opponents in the embarrassing position of having to defend the entire Anglican system. For a time, the plan worked well. But when the strategy broke down with the lords' rejection of the Bishops Exclusion Bill in June, 1641, an undisguised root-and-branch policy was quickly resumed.

Basic to the whole moderation program was the Ministers'

---

[34] _Ibid._, p. 287. [35] _Ibid._, p. 308.

Petition and Remonstrance. It was both the opening gun of the new campaign and the schedule of the manner of proceeding. The first hint we get of its existence is on December 12, 1640, when Baillie tells us that "sundrie countrie ministers, who meets with us, are on a remonstrance . . . . which, in name of the Church, shall shortlie be presented against the Bishops."[36] By December 28 it had been completed and was "posting through the land for hands to make it stark," while at the same time a small committee in Londone was drawing up the lengthy remonstrance which was to be attached.[37] After being read and approved by the Company of Ministers in full assembly, the petition "subscryved with above eight hundred ministers hands, was given in to the Lower House, by sixteen of the eldest and gravest of the number, together with their remonstrance of all the corruptions of that Church in doctrine, discipline, lyfe, and all" on January 23, 1641.[38]

Since a full copy of this paper has not been preserved, there has been some disagreement as to just what degree of reformation was called for. It is fairly certain, however, that ostensibly it embodied a program of reform rather than revolution. Rushworth, who was clerk to the house of commons, gave the document the mild description of a prayer for a "Redress of certain Irregularities in the Government of the Church."[39] This opinion is confirmed by the notes that have come down to us in the Verney papers. No mention was made of the complete extirpation of bishops, but at the same time it was clear that the old episcopacy was to be greatly altered. As might be expected, a number of the articles of the remonstrance dealt with such abuses as the bishops' supposed immorality, their possession of commendams, their great state, their meddling in temporal affairs, and their imposing oaths and subscriptions on Puritan divines.[40] But in addition, there were several articles which seriously undermined any sort of effective episcopal government. After denouncing the bishops for claiming "episcopye to bee of devine right," the remonstrance attacked their "sole power in ordination, and jurisdiction by vertue of a distinct order superior to a presbiter, which is not warranted by scripture or antiquity."[41] The fully radical nature of this article was brought out in the discussions before the commons committee where it was confidently asserted that "Presbiters and bishopps are all on."[42] Thus, the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance seems to have embodied a rather full program of church reform within the Anglican system which, if carried out, would greatly Presbyterianize the old Establishment, without, however, completely liquidating it.

---

[36] Ibid., p. 282. [37] Ibid., p. 286.

[38] Ibid., pp. 291-292; Journal of D'Ewes from Beginning of Long Parliament, p. 277; C.J., II, 72.

[39] Rushworth, IV, 152-153.

Despite this apparent moderation, there is a good deal of evidence to indicate that the ultimate aim of the ministers was fully as root-and-branch as that of the citizens of London. The Venetian ambassador declared positively that the ministers "petitioned that this hierarchy may be altogether removed from the Anglican Church"[43]--though it is rather difficult to say whether it was ignorance or astuteness that prompted his assertion. The evidence from Baillie is clearer. The uncompromising Scot's association with the sponsors of the Minister's Petition alone would cast suspicion on the genuineness of that document's moderation, but in his letters to Scotland the meaning is unmistakable. "A short petition," he wrote on December 28, 1640, "is formed by all the weell affected clergie for the overthrow of Episcopacie . . . . . At that tyme the root of Episcopacie will be assaulted with the strangest blast it ever felt in England." And he fervently urged the Scottish brethren to join their prayers with his "that the breath of the Lord's nostrills may joyne with the endeavours of weak men to blow up that old gourd wicked oak."[44]

---

[40] Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament, Temp. Charles I Printed from Original Pencil Memoranda Taken in the House by Sir Ralph Verney, Knight, Member for the Borough of Aylesbury, and Now in the Possession of Sir Harry Verney, Bart., ed. John Bruce ("Camden Society Publications," XXXI [London, 1845]), 4-14. (Hereafter cited as Verney Notes.)

[41] Ibid., p. 6. [42] Ibid., p. 9.

[43] Cal.S.P., Venet., Vol. XXV (1640-42), p. 118.

Hence the Ministers' Petition served a double purpose. On the one hand, it calmed the fears of the more conservative brethren. Sympathy with the ideal of reformed episcopacy was very widespread, and the ostensible restraint of the Ministers' Petition could be used to attract large numbers of Episcopal Puritans, thus forging one of the links in the united Puritan front. Looking back on the period in 1644, Edwards strongly confirmed the participation of the Episcopal Puritans, stating that the petition was "subscribed by many hundred godly Ministers, conformists and non-conformists" and that "the Government, Worship and Ceremonies were impleaded, in respect of many inconveniences, and evill consequents; but Petitioning against them, as sinfully evill, and absolutely unlawfull was declined."[45] On the other hand, the program of the Ministers' Petition provided an admirable chart for the piecemeal destruction of many of the principal features of historic Anglicanism. In an important passage in a letter written in March, 1641, Baillie frankly admitted that this was the rationale which undergirded the petition and the house's action on it.

---

[44] Baillie, I, 286-287.

[45] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 15.

> To propone the rooting out of the Bishops had been by pluralitie of voyces to have established them: they therefore resolved to proceed ordine resolutivo, to take doun the roof first to come to the walls, and, if God would help, not to stay till they raised the foundation: However to goe on so farr as was possible; leaving, without any legall confirmation, what now they cannot winne to till a better tyme.[46]

This strategy, moreover, seems to have been recognized for its true character by some of the loyal Anglicans. At any rate, the Episcopal Puritan scholars refused to have anything to do with the petition, despite the fact that it ostensibly proposed a program which they should have found most congenial.[47] Peter Heylyn also could read the real meaning of the Puritans' actions, though perhaps only from the vantage-point of years later. "Not only most of the Lords of the Lower-House," he noted, "and many Lower-House Lords in the Upper-House, resolving to pull up Episcopacy by the very roots, thought it convenient to begin with lopping the Branches as laying no pretence to Divine Institution."[48]

In carrying out this strategy, the Ministers' Petition was fairly successful. Together with the London Root and Branch Petition, it was entrusted to a special committee of the commons,[49] and by February this committee was hearing the testimony of the ministers headed by Cornelius Burges.[50] The clergymen had little difficulty in defending their paper "to the full contentment of all the Committee, except Mr. Selden, the avowed proctor for the Bishops,"[51] and on March 9 the committee reported out to the house three heads worthy of debate: the secular activities of the churchmen, the exclusive ecclesiastical power of the episcopate, and the value of deans and chapters.[52] Thus, the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance quickly became the basis for the parliament's gradual dismantling of the old church.

---

[46] Baillie, I, 308.

[47] Baillie was disgusted that the Episcopal Puritan scholars refused to join the party organization in the attack on the old church (Baillie, I, 287). The fact that the scholars did not join in the Ministers' Petition is ascertained from his description of the Williams committee where he uses "Remonstrants" to refer only to the root-and-branch faction (Baillie, I, 308-309).

[48] Heylyn, Part II, Book V, p. 17.

[49] C.J., II, 81.

[50] Verney Notes, pp. 4-14.

The Ministers' Petition gave the clergy their program of action and secured the adherence of the right wing of Episcopal Puritans; the Engagement was to complete the union by bringing in the Congregational left wing. Unfortunately, the exact date of this alliance with the Independents cannot be ascertained. Since the Independents apparently did not join in the Ministers' Petition[53] but were in full agreement with the Presbyterians by the middle of March,[54] sometime between the end of January and mid-March is indicated. Probably the later part of February is the most likely date. Although we cannot fix on a date with certainty, in the letters of Baillie we can roughly glimpse the steps by which the alliance was established. In less than a month after the sitting of parliament, conversations were being held, for Baillie wrote home that the two factions "do amicablie conspyre in one, to overthrow the Bishops and Ceremonies, hoping when these _rudera_ are put away, that they shall weell agree to build a new house, when the ground is weell sweeped."[55] At the end of December, 1640, Baillie again reported that although "there was some fear for these of the new way," they had had "much conference" toward the concluding of an alliance.[56] These conferences were apparently successful, for by February the Scots and the Independents were co-operating in the fight against the episcopal sympathizers.[57] And on March 15, 1641, Baillie could write to Scotland that full agreement had been reached.[58]

---

[51] Baillie, I, 302-303. [52] _C.J._, II, 100.

[53] Edwards, _Antapologia_, p. 256. [54] Baillie, I, 311.

[55] _Ibid._, p. 275. [56] _Ibid_. p. 287.

It is quite clear that throughout these negotiations the prime moving factor was the necessity of a united front. Baillie constantly tells us that the alliance was directed against the bishops, and Edwards clearly states that the pact resulted from the appreciation on both sides "how much our differences and divisions might distract the Parliament and hinder the taking away of Episcopall Government and the Reformation intended."[59] There was some hope, moreover, that once Anglicanism was destroyed Presbyterians and Independents might come to some agreement on the nature of the church to succeed it. We have already seen how Baillie was confident that when the ground was "weell sweeped," the Independents would "weell agree to build a new house," and on another occasion he was even so sanguine as to hope that they would "joyne to overthrow Episcopacie, erect Presbyterian government and Assemblies, and, in any difference they have, to be silent, upon hope either of satisfaction when we gett more leasure or of toleration."[60] This double basis of the alliance was apparently strengthened by the insistence of the politicians that nothing be permitted to divide the parliamentary support at this critical stage.[61]

As a result of these forces, the terms of the Engagement were drawn up and ratified at a full meeting of the Company of Ministers. The principal provision was stated by Edwards: "A mutuall silence was agreed upon for both sides, both in preaching, printing, and conferring with the people, (and especially Parliament men) of any of the points in difference betweene us."[62] This agreement could be terminated at will but not before formal notification. If someone transgressed by preaching or publishing controversially, the matter was to be brought before the Company.[63] Finally, should one side determine to terminate the arrangement, the Engagement had to be nullified by a formal declaration of the Company which released every man from his allegiance to the covenant.[64] Originally, it had been intended that the Engagement be directed against the sects as well as against the Anglicans, and a clause to this effect was inserted in the document. The Independents, however, understandably refused to implement this part of the program despite Presbyterian urgings, and it seems to have been allowed to become a dead article.[65] The Engagement was then drawn up in writing, each side receiving a copy, "that so if any difference did arise, or complaint come, we might recurre to the writing drawne up betweene us, and accordingly doe."[66]

---

[57] Ibid., p. 303. [58] Ibid., p. 311.

[59] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 240. [60] Baillie, I, 287.

[61] Apologeticall Narration, pp. 25-26.

With the ratification of the Engagement, the forging of the pan-Puritan front was completed. After this event, the Independents and the more conservative Presbyterian and Episcopal Puritans could carry through the reformation in a somewhat strained but workable alliance. Endowed with augmented strength from the unification and with the astute "moderation" strategy of the Ministers' Petition, the Puritan clergy could well look forward to a successful issue to their campaign. With these acts, the most important contribution of the Puritan clergy to the reformation was over. The battle between the episcopal party and the reformers was to be fought in the parliament, an arena denied to the clergy. From now on the conduct of the battle was in the hands of the Puritan parliament men, and the ministers were limited to the tasks of wooing the legislators and strengthening the position of their advocates at Westminister.

---

[62] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 241. [63] Ibid., p. 239.

[64] Ibid. [65] Ibid., pp. 241-243.

[66] Ibid., p. 241.

IV

While the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance was receiving the attention of the commons, the ministers took pains to bring their actions into accord with the new moderation strategy. This was not a spontaneous and independent effort on the part of individual divines, moreover, but a subject for legislation of the Company of Ministers. Apparently at the same time that the Engagement was signed, the Company consulted together on other ways to further "the taking away of Episcopall Government."[67] The very full account which Edwards gives us of the meeting is especially valuable, since it provides us with insight into the frankly deceptive measures which the ministers were willing to employ in pursuing the strategy of moderation. It was agreed upon, Edwards informs us,

> That the Godly Ministers of the Citie and Countrey should continue the use of some part of the Liturgie (namely what was best, and least offensive,) because they found that the Bishops fought under that Banner, and made use with the Gentrie and body of the common people to wrap up themselves in that, suggesting that the Parliament would take away the Common Prayer Booke, (which they made use of to save their owne standing, and to worke their owne ends the better.) And M. Goodwin ingenuously professed that he judged the moderate use of the Liturgie in this juncture of things, and for a time, conduced much to the Reformation aimed at . . . . and his vote was to use it.[68]

It is particularly important to note that this was a matter of general policy, and that the decision was binding on all of the Puritan divines. An earnest effort was made to secure universal compliance, and when it was brought to the attention of the Company that "some one or two Ministers in the Citie" had completely abandoned the liturgy and had "laid it aside in all Administrations," they"were sent unto from the Company of Ministers (and one of them came presently) to whom the sense of the Company was represented, and he dealt with to take it up againe, and to use some part of the Prayers in the Liturgie, especially in the Administration of the Sacraments."[69]

---

[67] Ibid., p. 240. [68] Ibid.

The impression made by this pretense of reverence for the Prayer Book services was soon strengthened by the participation of the leading Puritan divines in the conferences called by the house of lords and presided over by Bishop Williams. This conference could in no way be regarded as an attempt to secure a compromise with Anglo-Catholicism, for all the members were of unimpeachable orthodoxy. The committee was constituted by three groups: the "remonstrants" lead by Marshall, Calamy, and Burges; the Episcopal Puritan clergy such as Ussher, Holdsworth, and Ward; and lastly Williams himself who as politician and opportunist may be accounted sui generis. The embarrassing thing about the committee to the Puritan forces was the fact that in many particulars it was willing to grant the moderate program contained in the Ministers' Petition. Six conferences were held at Westminster House, and a remarkable amount of agreement was reached, though it must be admitted that the burning questions were only superficially gone into before the committee broke up.[70] According to Fuller, some were of the opinion that "such lopping might have saved the felling of episcopacy,"[71] but it seems difficult to believe that the Puritan leaders could have agreed to any such compromise as a definitive settlement. Their strategy had already been blocked out, and there was no reason why they should abandon it so long as it was winning results. Hacket's assertion that the Puritans procured the dissolution of the committee because they "knew not what to ask more than was yielded to them"[72] is undoubtedly a wild exaggeration. But it does seem likely that the reasonableness of the Episcopal party was uncomfortable to the Puritan leaders and that they welcomed the discontinuance of the conferences.

---

[69] Ibid., pp. 240-241.

[70] An account of the work of the committee, A Copie of the Proceedings of Some Worthy and Learned Divines Appointed by the Lords to Meet at the Bishop of Lincolnes in Westminster, Touching Innovations in the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England; Together with Considerations upon the Common Prayer Book (London, 1641) is reprinted in Shaw, II, 287-294.

In the meantime, the policy of moderation was slowly yielding fruits. After the discussion of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance in committee, the commons first took up the question of the secular employments of the clergy. This was an astute move, since this was a point on which least division was likely to take place. Erastianism, anticlericalism, and lay resentment against the political power of the clergy all combined to make the measure popular in parliament. On the basis of this sentiment, resolutions were passed in the commons for the exclusion of bishops from the house of lords, and all clergymen from commissions of the peace, from the Star Chamber, the privy council, and all other temporal offices.[73] By the first of May, a bill--the first Bishops Exclusion Bill--had been drawn up which embodied these reforms, passed the commons, and sent up to the lords.[74] In the meantime, the commons, passing over the more controversial head of the "sole ordination and jurisdiction" of episcopacy, turned to the question of deans and chapters.[75] After some delay, the lower house consented to hear on May 12 a full-scale debate on the subject between Hacket and Burges. Hacket's defense of the institution was apparently very able, and according to Fuller, it "wrought much on the House for the present."[76] In his reply Burges stressed the uselessness of the corporations, but greatly distressed his auditors by maintaining the sacredness of the endowments "so that the same doctrine was delivered by both the doctors, only they differed in their applications."[77] Despite this ominous forecast of future divisions within the party, it seems likely that a bill for the abolition of deans and chapters would have been passed and sent up to the lords had not other matters intervened.

---

[71] Fuller, Church History, III, 417.

[72] Hacket, Part II, p. 147.

[73] C.J., II, 101, 102, 110.

[74] Ibid., p. 131.

By the end of May, 1641, however, a crisis which had been impending for some time made itself felt acutely and finally destroyed the whole moderation program. The rock which proved so fatal to the strategy was the strength of the conservative sentiment in the house of lords. The Bishops Exclusion Bill had been sent to the upper house on May 1, but for several weeks the lords seem to have ignored it completely. Finally, the upper house resolved on May 24 and 25 to accept the provisions excluding clerics from the Star Chamber, the privy council, and commissions of peace, but rejected by a large vote the proposed expulsion of bishops from the house of lords.[78] This action, of course, manifested no love for prelacy among the lords, but rather offense that the commons should presume to alter the constitution of the upper house. The conservative party in the lords, moreover, had no desire to lose the episcopal bench--a solid bloc of twenty-six votes. Negotiations between the two chambers were in vain, and finally on June 8, on the insistence of the radical lords that the bill be accepted or rejected *in toto*, the Bishops Exclusion Bill was lost.[79]

---

[75] Ibid., p. 144.

[76] Fuller, Church History, III, 422.

[77] Ibid., pp.422-423. [78] L.J., IV, 256, 257.

This turn of affairs naturally precipitated a grave crisis in the Puritan party program. The removal of the bishops from the upper house was the *sine qua non* for the passage of the coming ecclesiastical legislation, and this initial failure forced the party leaders to rethink their entire strategy. The result was the abandonment of the moderation program, and the acknowledgment of frankly root-and-branch aims.

The reply of the Puritan forces to this resistance on the part of the house of lords was prompt and decisive. On May 27, three days after the upper house gave evidence that it was not likely to pass the Bishops Exclusion Bill, the famous Root and Branch Bill was introduced into the commons by Sir Edward Dering.[80] Dering himself was innocent of any knowledge of the bill and later confessed that "the Bill did hardly stay in my hand so long as to make a hasty perusall."[81] According to his own account, he was sitting in the gallery of the house with Sir Arthur Haselrigg when Oliver Cromwell and Sir Harry Vane brought the paper to them. Haselrigg, wrote Dering, "told me he was resolved that it should goe in, but was earnestly urgent that I would present it"[82]--a stratagem probably designed to conceal the real sponsors of the bill and to attract the votes of Dering's fellow-Episcopal Puritans.[83] At any rate, Dering consented, and seeing an appropriate opening in the debate, rose and presented the bill.

---

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 269.

[80] *C.J.*, II, 159.

[81] Dering, p. 63.

[82] *Ibid.*

Although we have little success in tracing the bill back to its origins, it seems altogether likely that the measure was drawn up with the full knowledge (if not co-operation) of all the radical religious leaders both within and without parliament. We know from the important private discussions on the bill which took place a few days later that Pym, Hampden, Harley and others were deeply involved. The fact that Stephen Marshall was also present at this meeting is strong evidence that the Company of Ministers was also represented in the creation of the bill.[84] It may be that the measure was at first introduced only tentatively as a means of frightening the upper house, but after the final rejection of the Bishops Exclusion Bill in June, the "rooters" proceeded in earnest.

It was at this point at which the secret session was held at which it was determined to prosecute vigorously the Root and Branch Bill. As D'Ewes recorded it, Harley, Pym, Hampden, Marshall, and others met, probably on the night of June 10, and agreed that the bill should be taken up the next day.[85] The result of this decision was that the bill, which had been resting quietly in committee was again brought before the house.[86] Progress on the measure was rapid, and within a few days concurrence for the principal provisions of the bill had been obtained overwhelmingly from the commons.[87] Yet the Root and Branch Bill was destined never to reach the upper chamber. That this was so was due to the violent divisions within Puritanism to which the bill gave rise.

---

[83] Apparently a not uncommon stratagem. A few days later when Sir Robert Harley moved to proceed with the bill, D'Ewes remarked, "For Mr. Hampden, out of his serpentine subtlety, did still put others to move those business that he contrived." Shaw, I, 82, quoting D'Ewes, _Diary_, III, 1014.

[84] Shaw, I, 81-82, quoting D'Ewes, _Diary_, III, 1014.

[85] _Ibid_. [86] _C.J._, II, 173, 174.

[87] Shaw, I, 93-95.

It was natural that as the time for determining the structure of the new church came closer, union among the various Puritan groupings became ever more difficult. Heretofore a pan-Puritan front had been preserved with considerable success, but with the debates on the Root and Branch Bill the powerful underlying antagonisms began to emerge most threateningly. The immediate cause of this disunity was the necessity of substituting some form of temporary church government for the to-be-abolished hierarchy. The passages quoted above from Baillie show clearly that as early as December, 1640, the main body of the Puritan party leaders had agreed upon an interim quasi-Presbyterian system to be settled in all the parishes by commissioners of the church appointed by parliament.[88] It was apparently this scheme which the younger Vane proposed in the house on June 21--a scheme which provided for the temporary exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction by commissioners appointed in equal numbers from clergy and laity.[89] But Episcopal Puritans and Independents were alert and watchful. Sir Edward Dering, in proposing the Root and Branch Bill, had declared that he regarded the measure only as a radical cure which still might be a prelude to the establishment of pure, primitive episcopacy,[90] and in this respect he became ever more determined as the progress of Presbyterianism increasingly alarmed him. Indeed, Dering had been on the point of presenting his own plan for the church on June 21, when Vane hastily interrupted him to secure the attention of the house for the authorized agreement.[91]

---

[88] See above, pp. 212-213. [89] Gardiner, IX, 390.

[90] Dering, pp. 64-65. [91] *Ibid.*, pp. 66-68.

Dering's plan had called for a system of dioceses, each coextensive with its county, and in which the controlling ecclesiastical power would be vested in a presbytery of twelve men, but where some allowance also would be made for a "Bishop, or an Over-seer, or a President, or a Moderator, or a Super-intendent, or a Ruling-elder; call him what you will."[92] "I must confesse," said Dering stoutly after Vane's interruption, "I am not satisfied with this way of Commissioners; it would joy me much, and satisfie me more, if as one government goes out, I could see another come in, and that without an Inter-regnum of Commissioners."[93] Thus, immediately and almost without warning, a dangerous cleavage had appeared between the adherents of primitive episcopacy and the Presbyterians.

Moreover, the Independents were also aroused. Conscious of their disadvantageous position as a minority and extremely watchful and jealous of the Presbyterians, the Independents feared any precedent which the overwhelming strength of the former might transform into a permanent arrangement. Such a danger the Independents apparently saw in the interim arrangements to be attached to the Root and Branch Bill. "About the time of passing a Bill, Edwards asked rhetorically of the Independents,

> in the House of Commons against Episcopacy, and of consultation and debate what should be in the interim, till another Government could be setled, were not you zealous, and active against that advice and counsell of a certaine number of grave Ministers in each County to be substituted for the time, (out of your feare of having but a shadow of Presbyterian governement, though but pro tempore) and how much you worked in that with some of place, and what the issue of that was, you may remember.[94]

It seems that as a result of the crystallization of this opposition, the bill rested in committee, and with the excitement attendant on the king's departure for Scotland, the house turned away to other things. The revelation of the explosive character of this debate had taught the commons the danger of bringing up the church question at this critical hour, while at the same time it was becoming increasingly clear that the advice of the English church would have to be taken for so important a decision. Thus, the first tentative attempt to secure the positive reformation had been halted by the appearance of fratricidal jealousies within the Puritan ranks.

---

[92] Ibid., p. 70. [93] Ibid., p. 68.

[94] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 222.

V

But another obstruction to the winning of the positive reformation had been disclosed by the debates on the Root and Branch Bill. The parliament evidently had no disposition to set up a Scottish-type Presbyterianism. Early in April, 1641, the Scottish commissioners had presented a demand for religious conformity between the two nations, and had found the commons polite but cool toward the idea.[95] It is significant, then, that when Vane's proposal on the Root and Branch Bill was debated in the house a few months later, the commons should have decided to eliminate all the clerical members from the suggested commissions and give all ecclesiastical jurisdiction to lay appointees of parliament.[96] Perhaps had the parliament been left to itself, some such system of mild Presbyterian or reformed Anglican Erastianism would have shortly been established. Events turned out differently, however, and in the period of the Civil War the parliament had to turn to the Scots for help. It was then and only then that the parliament could be persuaded to commit itself to a positive reformation on the Scottish model.

---

[95] Shaw, I, 129-131. [96] Gardiner, IX, 407.

As yet these rocks in the path of reformation were but carelessly regarded, but an appreciation of their importance was growing all the time. By the end of 1641 it had become evident that some sort of modus vivendi would have to be worked out between the various mutually antagonistic forms of Puritanism and between the clergy and the laity before the reformation could be completed. To this end the attention of the Puritan clergy began to be directed.

This did not mean, however, that the pressure on the old Anglican Establishment was for a moment relaxed. On the contrary, the ambition of completely destroying the Church of England of the Reformation was openly, frankly, and enthusiastically avowed. A few men like Bishop Williams may have hoped that some sort of compromise was still possible with the "rooters," but for the most part they were quickly undeceived. In July Williams had even gone so far as to suggest a highly concessive compromise plan,[97] but, as Fuller remarks, there was "no great matter made thereof: the anti-episcopal party conceived it needless to shave their beards whose heads they intended to cut off, designing an utter extirpation of bishops."[98] At the same time, the old church was rapidly passing away. In October, 1641, a second Bishops Exclusion Bill was introduced into parliament[99] and won the consent of the lords in February of 1642.[100] Moreover, by December of 1641, the fast day preachers were impressing on the commons that the coming reformation could be no moderate or conservative change.

---

[97] Shaw, I, 71-73; The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, ed. Samuel Rawson Gardiner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), pp. 167-178; L.J., IV, 296, 298, 308.

[98] Fuller, Church History, III, 426.

[99] C.J., II, 291, 292, 293.

[100] L.J., IV, 564.

The duty of the members, according to Calamy, was to "bring us back not only to our first Reformation in King Edwards dayes, but to reform the Reformation itself." "For we were then," he went on to explain, "newly crept out of Popery, and . . . . it was impossible but our garments should smell a little of the dungeon from whence we came."[101] As a result of these tendencies, and despite the fact that no decisive legislation was yet taken by parliament, it came to be generally assumed that the old church was hors de combat and that some sort of Puritan Establishment would eventually be substituted for it.

As a consequence of this changing situation, the Puritan leaders began to divert their energies from the attack on Anglicanism to the attempt to solve the problems of Puritan disunity and parliamentary Erastianism. In 1641 Edwards had expressed the conviction that the dangers of Anglicanism were passing from the scene, and that it was the rapidly proceeding disintegration of Puritanism which now merited attention.[102] To deal with this situation the ministers seem to have been most anxious to secure a free Puritan synod. This had been the Puritan hope ever since the opening of parliament in 1640, and in the later months of 1641 the demand became endlessly repeated. "I beseech You . . . . ," Burges implored the commons, "to resume and pursue your first thoughts of setting up God and his Ordinances . . . . by calling to your assistance a free Synode of the Grave Ministers of this Nation . . . . That our Church and the Government thereof may be no longer laid waste, and exposed to Confusion, under the plausible pretence of not forcing mens Consciences."[103] And a month later in December, 1641, Calamy repeated this familiar plea but with the interesting addition that the parliament must "be carefull to make such qualifications, both of the Persons that are to choose, and to be chosen, that no Minister liable to any just exception, shall have a voyce in this Synod, for fear lest our greatest remedy prove to be our greatest ruine."[104] To add further pressure to their demands, the clergy of London presented a lengthy petition embodying their desire for an authorized clerical assembly.[105] The fact that the Independents and the sects were vigorously opposing the calling of such an assembly and were playing for time only increased the alarm and anxiety of the bulk of the Puritan adherents.[106]

---

[101] Calamy, Englands Looking-glasse, pp. 23-24.

[102] Edwards, Reasons Against the Independent Government, "The Epistle Dedicatory," unpaged.

But beyond this growing concern over the rise of separatist Puritanism and the eagerness to be about the building of the new church, there was a certain malaise about the unresponsiveness of the laity to the aspirations of the clergy. The ministers seem to have become increasingly aware of the power which secular causes exercised over the members, and desperately insisted on the primacy of the religious reforms. As early as September, 1641, Marshall had felt it necessary to warn the commons:

> Now you have built your own house, and procured Civill Liberties should you let Gods house lie waste, should you be (as many fear you are) lesse zealous in Gods cause, then in your own, I solemnly professe unto you, the God of heaven will require it at your hands, and the hands of your posteritie: he will curse all your blessings, and overturn what you think you have established.[107]

---

[103] Cornelius Burges, Another Sermon Preached to the Honorable House of Commons now Assembled in Parliament, November the Fifth, 1641 (London: P. Stephens, 1641), pp. 63-64.

[104] Calamy, Englands Looking-glasse, p. 24.

[105] Nalson, II, 764-766. [106] Edwards, Antapologia, pp. 224, 251.

[107] Stephen Marshall, A Peace-offering to God, A Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons Assembled in Parliament, at their Publique Thanksgiving, Sept. 7, 1641 (London: Samuel Man, 1641), p. 50.

And a few months later Burges drily remarked to the members:

> I know your businesses and diversions have been extraordinary: yet in the midst of them all, You have found opportunitie to vindicate and setle your own Rights and Liberties. Therefore I hope You will finde both time and hearts to consider what is to be done for that God who hath done so much for You.[108]

By the early months of 1642, this distrust had become deeply rooted, and the fear began to haunt the Puritan clergy that the members meant to wait for the full blossoming of Puritan disintegration, and then reap the fruits of the religious disunity. Thus the parliament would be in a position to repudiate the obligation of setting us a strong, independent, Puritan church. "There are some among us," declared Calamy bitterly,

> that raise up an ill report upon the reformation intended, as if the Parliament had a purpose to bring in an Anarchie, to reduce every thing into its first Chaos, to leave every man to do what is good in his owne eyes . . . . . And upon this false rumour they despise the blessed Canaan that we are going into.[109]

Unhappily, the English Israelites were destined never to see that blessed Canaan. Hopelessly divided among themselves and opposed by a vigorous lay spirit both within and without the movement, the Puritan community found it impossible to release its energy for the attainment of that goal for which they had presumably been striving since the days of Mary Tudor. Faced with this situation, the Puritan flock found itself condemned to wander aimlessly in the desert until the Restoration destroyed forever the hopes of a Puritan England.

---

[108] Burges, Another Sermon Preached to the Commons, p. 60.

[109] Calamy, God's Free Mercy to England, p. 46.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DISINTEGRATION OF PURITANISM AND THE PURITAN PARTY

By the end of the first year of the Long Parliament the Puritan party was seemingly headed for complete triumph. As a result of the groundwork laid during the years of frustration and repression the party had emerged in 1640 strong and thoroughly organized. As we have seen, the clergy especially were active in heightening their influence through organization and also by making full use of their support among the Scots, the City, and the Puritan group in parliament. As a result of these pressures and of the definitely hostile atmosphere in England towards Laudianism, the difficulty encountered in destroying the old church was successfully overcome. Nevertheless, the victory was somewhat deceptive. For no matter how effective the Puritan clergy were in their campaigns, it must always be remembered that all their energies were perforce directed toward the convincing of the members of the two houses. At times the clerical leaders were so intimately associated with the party leaders in the parliament on terms of practical equality that the character of the clergy as suitors to the houses was obscured. But for most parliament members the question was never forgotten, and Erastians like Selden certainly were aware of the danger of Puritan clerical pretensions immediately after the meeting of the Long Parliament. More surprising was the discovery that Puritanism harbored within itself a living anticlericalism, and it was not long before the Puritan laymen demonstrated that they shared the English disinclination to invest the clergy with any considerable independent authority. But it was not anticlericalism alone which snatched the fruits of victory from the Puritan party. Formidable though this force was, it would have had far greater difficulty defeating the Puritan clergy had it not been aided by a series of revolutions within Puritanism itself. For it was at this moment that a very general disintegration of the Puritan movement took place--a disintegration which divided and finally destroyed the Puritan party.

I

Certainly one of the greatest factors which had contributed to the Puritan victories was the unity of the party. In large measure this unity was a natural reflection of the rather vague, amorphous unity which obtained in the movement as a whole. It is true that after the calling of the Long Parliament Puritanism began to manifest its divisive and separatistic tendencies on a grand scale, but this was not true of the earlier phases of the movement. Prior to 1640 Puritanism was principally regarded as a type of religious mentality,[1] and while the Puritan concern for some sort of New Testament polity was there, it was definitely in the background.[2] To be sure, a number of sects flourished, but these were small in number and importance, and men of all parties despised their adherents as being among the "mean and baser" sort of people. In general it may be said that the Puritan movement was characterized by a vague undenominationalism in which all Puritans united in a common opposition to the regime of the prelates. This character of the movement was vigorously asserted by the Independents in 1643 when they declared that until recently "the full strength and streame of our Non-conformists wrytings and others are spent rather in arguments against, & for the overthrowing the Episcopall government, and the corruptions that cleave to our worship . . . . then in the proofe of a combined classicall Presbyteriall government."[3] Vehement denunciations of the prelates, however, did not mean that the main stream of Puritanism was ever tempted into separatism or sectarianism. Rather, the religious diversity which marked England after the beginning of the Civil Wars was due not so much to the growth of the old sects as to the explosion of a Puritanism that was hitherto largely undenominational. Most Puritans, except those who were party leaders or who took special pains to keep themselves informed of developments in the movement, probably shared the experience of Baxter who could say that until 1641 he "never thought what Presbytery or Independency was, nor ever spake with a man who seemed to know it."[4] On the whole, the pre-1640 Puritans can be said to be "all such as had till then conformed, and took those things to be lawful in case of necessity, but longed to have that necessity removed."[5]

---

[1] See Baxter's famous sketch of the Puritanism of his father (Reliquiae Baxterianae, Part I, pp. 2-3).

[2] According to Usher, even the Classis Movement of the sixteenth century sought only to exist within Puritanism (Usher, Presbyterian Movement, p. xxiv).

The unity which this formless character of the movement gave to the Puritan party during the early months of the Puritan Revolution was seconded by a conscious effort to de-emphasize any divisions which threatened to arise. For despite the general undenominationalism of Puritanism before 1640, differences were making themselves known which were causing grave concern among the party leaders. The general hope was, as Thomas Shepard described it, that "if the Prelates were downe, all would agree in one,"[6] and it was on the basis of this hope that the agreement--half alliance and half truce--was made between the various factions within the movement for co-operation in pulling down the old church.

---

[3] Apologeticall Narration, p. 15.

[4] Henry Martyn Dexter, Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years as Seen in its Literature (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1880), p. 651, quoting Richard Baxter, True History of Councils, p. 90.

[5] Reliquiae Baxterianae, Part I, p. 34.

Throughout the year following the meeting of the Long Parliament, however, the unity of the party was becoming severely strained. This was primarily due to the fact that the differences which lurked in the half-consciousness of Puritanism before 1640 now became acute. Even in 1640 it was generally recognized that there were various shades of Puritan belief, and however formless the old nonconformity may have been, it still nourished peculiar and divergent loyalties which could not easily be reconciled. Of these Independency had already developed into a strong and well organized faction. In 1640 it was still small, but it was extraordinarily rich in leadership and aggressive and audacious in its undertakings. It had long since organized the English Congregational Classis in the Netherlands and the settlement of Massachusetts Bay, and when the ministers of the "new way" were recalled from Holland in 1640 they came determined to further Congregationalism in the mother-country. Although strong Episcopal and Presbyterian loyalties existed in English Puritanism in 1640, neither had achieved anything like the tight solidarity of the Independents. The Episcopal Puritans were probably more numerous than they were vocal, for the tide of the reaction against Laudianism was running strongly against them. Despite the small weight which they carried, however, it is certain that there were scattered throughout the Puritan following a not inconsiderable number of clergy and laity who, though they shared the Puritan attitude toward life, were nonetheless firmly attached to episcopal government. These Episcopal Puritans were strongly opposed to high church Anglicanism, but hoped that by capitalizing on the support of the leading Puritan scholars and by championing the immensely popular notion of a reformed episcopacy they might frustrate the designs of the more radical Puritan factions. Perhaps even more vague and undiciplined than the Episcopal Puritans were the Presbyterians. Contemporaries sometimes took it for granted that the main body of Puritans were Presbyterian, and it may be that something of the tradition of Cartwright lived on in the movement.[7] Moreover, the example of the foreign Reformed churches and the sense of close kinship with the Scottish clergy must have carried some weight. On the whole, however, it seems clear that the uncertain gropings of Puritanism toward Presbyterianism did not acquire direction or power until the political situation in 1640 provided a decisive impetus. Nevertheless, this incipient Presbyterianism when combined with an aggressive Independency and stubborn Episcopal Puritanism was sufficient to make the Puritan party of 1640 a somewhat unstable organism.

---

[6] Miller, p. 265, quoting Thomas Shepard and John Allin, A Defense of the Answer Made unto the Nine Questions or Positions Sent from New-England against the Reply thereto by Mr. John Ball (London, 1648), p. 16.

These elements of disunity, already somewhat threatening, were destined to grow more dangerous as the revolution advanced. First of all, in the excitement and activity of the party manoeuvering which led up to the Civil War, it was inevitable that the various Puritan groups should be made more conscious of the differences between them, and that this consciousness should in turn further the crystallization of these groups into closed factions. Very soon after the opening of the Long Parliament it became apparent that the old Anglicanism was doomed and that the church of its successor would soon have to be established. The result was to produce an unhealthful atmosphere of apprehension and rivalry which only the absolute necessity of common action against the hierarchy could conteract. The Independents, sure of themselves and already somewhat belligerent in 1640, rapidly became more and more hostile toward their fellow-Puritans. Their strength was greatly augmented by the return of a number of their most able ministers from New England and the Low Countries--some of whom, it is worth noting, had become bitterly prejudiced against Presbyterianism abroad. Moreover, as the mass of the Puritans moved toward the Presbyterian system, the tension between the two groups correspondingly increased, until it gradually became clear that a decisive struggle could not long be postponed. The Episcopal group, despite the fact that it never succeeded in obtaining any vocal popular following, tended to become alienated as the treatment of the old church became ever more radical. Various additions also came to it as men became frightened at the radical turn which the revolution had taken, and Erastians, royalists, loyal Anglicans, and libertines for sundry reasons all rallied to the banner of reformed episcopacy.

---

[7] Usher insists that there was "no connection between the two movements; there was even no continuity reaching from one to the other, from the 'Presbyterians' of Elizabeth to the 'Presbyterians' of the Civil War" (Usher, Presbyterian Movement, p. xxiv). But this seems to be putting the case a little strong.

Significant as was the growth of the party spirit among the Independent and Episcopal Puritans, the most important alteration was the transformation of the old Puritan party into the Presbyterian party. It seems clear that until the time for decision was upon them, Puritans had not given much thought to the form of church to be set up. When the need did make itself felt acutely, however, political circumstances pointed the way so unmistakably that it was perfectly natural for Puritanism to gravitate toward Presbyterianism. To some extent, the rapid adoption of the Presbyterian system must be attributed to the fact that for many years it had successfully functioned in much of Protestant Europe. But a more important factor was the influence of the Scots. It was the Scots' revolution and the Scots' army which had halted the hierarchy's "persecution," and it was the Scottish threat in the north which kept Charles willing to go along with the English revolution. By the time the Scottish commissioners arrived in 1640 and perhaps even before, a close bond between the Puritan leaders and the Scottish kirk had been consummated. For Puritanism it was in large part a question of securing support for a thorough English reformation, and the movement's political dependence on Scottish aid was finally symbolized in the signing of the Solemn League and Covenent in 1643. This conversion from a general and open Puritanism to a specific and narrowly defined Presbyterianism was rather abrupt, and Baxter several times emphasized that "almost all those afterward called Presbyterians, were before Conformists."[8]

Episcopal, Independent, Presbyterian--each of these growing factions within Puritanism was certain that its own particular polity was de jure divino, and the resulting contest between absolutes could not but rend the Puritan party. But beyond the pale, a new force was increasing in a manner profoundly to affect the course of Puritanism in England. Episcopal, Independent, and Presbyterian Puritans, however they might damn one another, always re-

---

[8] Reliquiae Baxterianae, Part I, p. 33.

garded their opponents as within the realm of religious respectability, but now a new menace to Puritan unity was making gigantic gains outside this realm. For the first time since the Reformation, the despised and fantastic sects were assuming an increasingly important role in the English religious scene. Although few of the old Puritan leaders were to be won to the new doctrines, almost overnight the sects were to withdraw whole segments of the population from orthodox Puritanism, and finally to make any sort of Puritan Establishment impossible.

II

The first great schism in the Puritan forces ended in the alienation of the Episcopal group. The break was not sudden but gradual and piecemeal. It seems to have been a question of gradual desertion as individuals lost faith in the party leaders in London. Thus it was that though with some Episcopal Puritans[9] the rift began immediately after the opening of the Long Parliament, there were others who, hanging on to 1643, were found willing to attend the initial meetings of the Westminster Assembly. Still others, deeply involved in the party organization, continued their allegiance until far into the Civil War, though retaining their devotion to episcopacy while their fellows conceived a new passion for Presbyterianism. Despite these varying and individualistic reactions, however, episcopal sentiment tended to converge around two great principles: the first provided for a Puritan reform of the historic Church of England, while the second envisaged a radical reversion to a New Testament polity, this time in favor of reformed episcopacy. The one was a transformation, while the other was as fully revolutionary in principle as Presbyterianism or Independency, though in fact animated by a strong conservative bias. Yet for most men this distinction was an abstraction, and they often acted inconsistently with an appreciation and a confusion of both principles.

---

[9] Perhaps it is best at this point to introduce a few remarks on my use of the term "Episcopal Puritan." Difficulties have long been encountered in finding an adequate definition of "Puritan" and I fear that "Episcopal Puritan" will be equally confusing. By the term I mean to denote those men, conformist or nonconformist, who looked on the Elizabethan Settlement as too conservative and who wished to go on to a more thorough reformation, but who at the same time had a strong bias in favor of the retention of episcopacy. The difficulty of distinguishing such men from the moderate Anglicans will be obvious to all. In general I would say that the moderate Anglicans were conservative defenders of the old settlement (hence their opposition to the innovator, Laud) while the Episcopal Puritans were willing to experiment in further reformation. I think it would be confusing to equate the contemporaneous term "Doctrinal Puritan" with "Episcopal Puritan." The so-called "Doctrinal Puritans" were simply Calvinist conformists and not necessarily reformers. Thus, to my mind, Grindal would be an Episcopal Puritan while Whitgift would not, though both were confirmed Calvinists.

In some respects, the alienation of the Episcopal Puritans was a matter of no great moment to the Puritan party. Save Burges, none of the Episcopal group could be called an important leader in the party organization, although many of them had wide reputations as scholars. Furthermore, any loss which the Puritan forces sustained by their defection was more than compensated for by the acquisition of Scottish support. This was certainly Baillie's view, and he often speaks contemptuously of the fatal moderation and inactivity of the Episcopal group. Yet in all likelihood the Episcopal Puritan cause was of far greater significance than men like Baillie supposed. There are good grounds to believe that it was in the moderate Puritan program that most Englishmen outside of London found the truest approximation of their conceptions of right religious reform. That the misconception could have risen lies in the fact that the Episcopal leaders were, for the most part, men of academic life, not suited to organizing the mass of those who favored a reformed episcopacy into a political faction. The result was that the Episcopal group was never given the hearing to which its numbers would seem to have entitled it. As a consequence, when the storm broke in 1642, the king as the champion of episcopacy was able to gather around him, not only Laudians and traditional Anglicans, but also a number of Puritans who, though they hated the "popish innovations," were unable to tolerate the complete destruction of the old ecclesiastical constitution.

The plight of these Anglican Puritans was difficult from the very first. Like their fellow-Puritans throughout England, they were opposed to the practices of the high churchmen and were genuinely glad at the first steps which the Long Parliament took to reform religion. But as the tide of reformation quickly swept on to more radical measures, their enthusiasm cooled, and they found themselves obliged to drop out and even to assume roles which their former friends regarded as those of defenders of prelacy. The trouble was that the Episcopal Puritans remained what they had always been, while their fellows, caught up by the various revolutions within the movement, were flung down the path to Presbyterianism, Independency, or some form of late, degenerate Puritanism. The case of Samuel Ward, the great Puritan savant at Cambridge, was the case of them all. "He turned with the times," wrote Fuller, "as a rock with the tide . . . . . In a word, he was counted a Puritan before these times, and popish in these times; and yet, being always the same, was a true Protestant at all times."[10]

Thus, the main strength of Episcopal Puritanism seems to have been derived from its conservatism and continuity with the past. Nothing could be farther from the truth than to regard it as some sort of desperate compromise with royalism. Rather, it might with some reason claim to represent the traditional form of the movement. To be sure, Cartwright and other early Puritan theorists had come under the influence of the Reformed discipline and tended to think in Presbyterian terms.[11] But by 1640 what most men thought of as the "good old nonconformist" was a popular preacher not unlike John Dod or John Rogers who, though he might dispense with the surplice and leave the Book of Sports to be read by his clerk, devoted his principal energies to winning souls to the serious religious life and never thought of pulling down episcopacy. Under the impact of the Laudian "persecution" this conservatism was severely put to the test, but the reaction does not seem in many cases to have gone beyond a longing for a reformed episcopacy. In those cases where it did, we can already get a foretaste of that tension which was later to develop between this conservative Puritanism and its more revolutionary deviations. Thus, shortly after the founding of Massachusetts, we find that champion of godly episcopacy, Sir Simonds D'Ewes, remonstrating with John Winthrop for having discarded the Anglican heritage and the latter retorting that the New Englanders had "come to clearer light and more Libertye."[12]

---

[10] Fuller, Worthies, I, 488.

But after 1640 the Puritan party and great masses of the Puritan clergy committed themselves decisively to Presbyterianism. The transformation came rather suddenly, and many an Anglican Puritan, intent on doing battle with the hierarchy, took some time to awake to the true state of affairs. This was not the case, however, with those who were important Puritan leaders in their own right, and who had every opportunity to observe the changes that were taking place in the movement--the Puritan scholars. It is interesting to note that these men, who after 1640 were to be the leading Episcopal Puritans, had been, throughout the reign of Charles, the movement's most eminent figures. This fact was strikingly brought out when the Scots sought to contact the English Puritan leaders in 1639. The Scottish agent was given orders to see, not Marshall, Calamy, or White, but Samuel Ward, Daniel Featly, John Prideaux, and Richard Holdsworth--all scholars, and two of them at the University of Cambridge.[13] With the addition of Ralph Brownrig, and above all the great Ussher, the catalogue of the scholarly Episcopal Puritan group is fairly complete. The influence of these men was apparently very considerable at Cambridge, for the university, one of the principal Puritan strongholds, seems to have been dominated by the Episcopal Puritan position.[14]

---

[11] The best work on Cartwright is A. F. Scott Pearson, Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535-1603 (Cambridge: University Press, 1925).

[12] Winthrop Papers, III, 172.

With the exception of Ussher, the careers of most of these men were to a high degree similar. All of them were Puritans and Calvinists, and yet they had a strong attachment to the Reformation traditions of the Church of England. They watched with mounting disapproval the rise of high church doctrines and did all that they could to combat them. Because of this they were, like all Puritans, personae non gratae to the hierarchy, and though their intellectual eminence seems to have protected them from discipline, we find Ward writing to Ussher that he had been censured for favoring Puritans.[15] At the calling of the Long Parliament they eagerly awaited the promised reformation; yet within a year they were all suspect by the same parliament.

---

[13] Baillie, I, 225-228.

[14] For the stand taken by Cambridge in the period after 1640, see James Bass Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, III (Cambridge: University Press, 1911), 203-340.

[15] Works of James Ussher, XV, 580-581.

Perhaps most indicative of the position of the Episcopal Puritans was the career of Richard Holdsworth.[16] He had early attained a wide reputation for his learning, and when he was appointed rector of St. Peter-le-Poer in London he became equally well-known as a popular preacher. It was natural that when the position fell vacant in 1637, Holdsworth was chosen to fill John Preston's old post as master of that training school for Puritan divines, Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Throughout the Laudian decade he never gave over his opposition to the high church school and was among those who protested in 1640 against the continuation of convocation after the dismissal of parliament. In 1641 he gave testimony of his disapprobation of the Laudian policy and at the same time instanced his growing disquiet at the radical turn which the reformation was taking. Writing to Sir Edward Dering he bemoaned "the sad condicion of the Church, and soe of the Vniversity, which the indiscreet and offensive practises of some of our owne order, by their introduction of superstitious rites, and preaching of unsavory doctrines, hath brought upon both; whereby, they stirred up the displeasure of the common people of this lande against us."[17] It is indicative of the divided allegiance of Episcopal Puritanism that the occasion of Holdsworth's writing to Dering was an accusation lodged against him for anti-parliamentary utterances, and three months later additional evidence was given of the opposite reactions which Holdsworth's conduct could elicit. By now he had become actively opposed to the parliament's church policy, and on October 29, 1641, Oliver Cromwell rose in the commons and spoke "somewhat bitterly against doctor

---

[16] Mandell Creighton, "Richard Holdsworth," DNB, Vol. IX.

[17] Proceedings in Kent, p. 53.

Howlsworth."[18] Yet what bewildered the house was that the doctor was an eminent Puritan, and D'Ewes answered Cromwell confessing, "I know him to be a most learned man, and I am confident that hee would [be] most readie to further a reformation in the church."[19] After this Holdsworth quickly became the chief organizer of the anti-Presbyterian forces at Cambridge, and the world was treated to the incredible spectacle of the master of Emmanuel leading the University of Cambridge in the defiance of the Puritan parliament. After the outbreak of the Civil War he supplied the king with money collected by the university and preached against the parliament. This stand ended in 1643 when the doctor was thrown in the Tower and deprived of his academic offices.[20]

Though perhaps somewhat more spectacular, Holdsworth's history does not differ to any great extent from the careers of the other Episcopal Puritans. With few exceptions they were led to embrace the king's cause, and after the royalist capitulation they died ruined and impoverished, sometimes in prison. Despite their bona fide interest in reformation, they looked on the more radical reformers with the deepest distrust. Their attitude toward the party organization was typically expressed by Ussher:

> Their pretences are taken away if we consider, that the continuance of the established religion and government, together with a just reformation of all abuses and grievances has been offered, promised, protested for by his Majesty: but the religion and government of Church and State, as by law established, will not content the adverse party, however they pretend to fight for religion and laws: . . . . their end intended and driven at is the abolishing of the publick Service and Liturgy, which is established by law, the utter taking away of episcopal government, which has always been.[21]

---

[18] Journal of D'Ewes from First Recess of Long Parliament, p. 52.

[19] Ibid., p. 53.

[20] Mandell Creighton, "Richard Holdsworth," DNB, Vol. IX.

[21] Works of James Ussher, I, 240.

These lines show the bitterness with which the Episcopal group had come to regard the bulk of the Puritan reformers, a reflection of the first big break in Puritan ranks. Just what were the steps that led to the alienation of the Episcopal Puritans?

In one sense, it may be said that the break with the Episcopal Puritans was accomplished almost immediately after the opening of the Long Parliament. That is to say, it was very soon apparent that all co-operation between the Episcopal Puritan scholars and the party organization was impossible. In large part, this was due to the early recognition by the root-and-branch leaders in London of the strength of their position. As a result, there was little disposition to accommodate the university men whose assistance they felt they did not need. Perhaps at the very beginning of the parliament the assurance of a radical reformation by the legislature was not so clearly seen, for, as we have noted, there was some concern for building up a Puritan faction in convocation. Puritans could still be interested in the clerical elections and a strong Puritan party was actually returned to the convocation of 1640.[22] According to Baillie, the body contained a large group of moderate reformers and even a sizable root-and-branch party.[23] Certainly reforms proceeding from convocation would have been most acceptable to the Episcopal Puritans, for it would have meant a reformation within the traditions of the old church. It was soon perceived, however, that the state of popular feeling was such that no compromise with the old order need be made, and the attitude of the party leaders toward a reformation through convocation seems to have been that of Baillie: "the lesse good they intend the better; the more easilie they will be gotten overthrown."[24]

---

[22] See above, chap. vii.

[23] Baillie, I, 282.

If the root-and-branch attitude characterized the Puritan organization leaders from the very beginning, it is not surprising that the moderate element within the party refused to follow them. Thus, it appears that within a month of the opening of the parliament the Episcopal Puritans had scented the way things were going and had refused to climb on the party's bandwagon. "Not one I hear of," wrote the disgusted Baillie, "either in the Universities or in dignities, does speak as yet. Holsworth, Ward, Feitly, Brommerik [Brownrig], Prideaux, or any famous for learning, nothing is expected from them."[25] But what is most revealing is that their silence caused little concern with Baillie, since, as he said, "there is great appearance that God will doe his own work, without these Rabbies help."[26] The Episcopal Puritans were obviously in a difficult position. They did not want to play into the hands of the root-and-branch party, and yet their reticence laid them open to the accusation of flirting with the high churchmen. It was this embarrassment that made Baillie so gleeful. "Since, to this day," he wrote, "not one of these men hes had so much grace as to open their mouth against any of the Canterburian abominations, which all the world here cryes out upon, I trust they cannot thryve in any of their designes."[27]

With the drawing up and presentation of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance the break was formally acknowledged, for hereafter the Puritan world remained divided between the great mass of Puritan clergy who signed the document--the "Remonstrants" --and those few divines who, however orthodox they might be, remained aloof from party activity. This does not mean, however, that the Episcopal Puritan leaders were cut off from all influence on the settlement of religion. Rather, it was the Episcopal Puritans who made the first constructive proposals regarding what shape the new church should take. These proposals were advanced at the house of lords Committee on Religion presided over by Bishop Williams, and their rejection by the Puritan party leaders marks the beginning of a bitter enmity between the two factions.

---

[24] _Ibid_. [25] _Ibid_., p. 275.

[26] _Ibid_. [27] _Ibid_., p. 287.

The fact that the Episcopal Puritans and the Remonstrants were recognized as being on opposite sides shows how far the split had already progressed. The committee was composed entirely of moderate Anglicans and Puritans; even Baillie admits the opponents of the remonstrants were "reputed the most able and orthodox divines of the land."[28] The discussions which took place in March and April of 1641 were apparently not without achievement, and a number of reforms were actually decided upon. The most important debates, however, certainly must have touched on the question of episcopacy. Seemingly it was for this occasion that Ussher developed his great scheme for a limited episcopal government--the _Reduction of Episcopacy unto the Form of Synodical Government_.[29] Broadly speaking, the plan would have introduced a polity which was basically Presbyterian but which would have retained the forms and terminology of Anglicanism and made a place for a "president" or bishop.[30] The plan made considerable concessions to Presbyterian feeling, and its general acceptability was shown by the fact that the Presbyterians themselves proposed it as a basis for comprehension at the Restoration. It may be that the Remonstrant divines, led by Burgess, Marshall, Calamy, and White, entered into the discussions in good faith, but it also seems certain that they had determined not to let accommodation proceed so far as to allow themselves to become dissuaded from overthrowing episcopacy. The result was that the conferences broke down before serious disagreements were encountered, although it was inevitable that these would have come later. It seems that public opinion had advanced so far and the Episcopal faction was so weak that the debates had become merely academic disputations. Some perhaps would have liked to see a reformation along these lines, but most were for a policy of "thorough." "A few weak Brethren," was the conclusion of Hacket who himself attended the discussions, "might take these Alterations in good part, which were like to be obtained; but the noted men of the Faction could not bring themselves into Fame and Name, and somewhat else, but in a greater confusion."[31] The failure of the Williams Committee to effect what seemed like a promising accommodation confirmed the Episcopal Puritans in the opinion that nothing could be gained from co-operation with the party organization. As a consequence, the discussions were the last efforts at reformation in which they participated. For when, as Baxter said, "the same Men saw that greater Things were aimed at, and Episcopacy it self in danger, or their Grandeur and Riches at least, most of them turned against the Parliament, and were almost as much displeased as others."[32]

---

[28] _Ibid._, pp. 308-309.

[29] _Works of James Ussher_, XII, 527-536.

[30] _Ibid._

Yet however lightly the party organization might regard the loss of the Episcopal Puritan university scholars, they could not view with equal equanimity the alienation of all those who adhered to the idea of reformed episcopacy. Great numbers both of clergy and laity were strongly attracted to the idea of a limited episcopacy, while time and again the leading members of parliament professed that in their denunciations of bishops they meant only Laudian prelacy.[33] Baillie, despite his unusually sanguine attitude toward the chances of introducing Presbyterianism into England, did not hesitate to pay tribute to the widespread respect which the conception of primitive episcopacy commanded. Before the end of 1640 he noted that the adherents of the ideal were "a great faction,"[34] and in a little over a month he could write of the bishops, "We trust God will putt them doun, bot the difficultie to gett all the tapouns of their roots pulled up are yet insuperable."[35] Only a few weeks later he again gave voice to his doubts and also unintentionally revealed what a giant struggle Presbyterianism was having in supplanting episcopacy in the English consciousness:

---

[31] Hacket, Part II, p. 147.

[32] Reliquiae Baxterianae, Part I, p. 27.

> How this matter will goe, the Lord knowes: all are for the erecting of a kind of Presbytries, and for bringing doun the Bishops in all things, spirituall and temporall, so low as can be with any subsistance; bot their utter abolition, which is the onlie aime of the most godlie, is the knott of the question; we must have it cutted by the axe of prayer: God, we trust, will doe it.[36]

Strong and widespread feeling of this sort could not be safely ignored, and as a matter of fact the party managers seem to have taken pains to conciliate it.

Thus it was that the break with the Episcopal Puritan leaders did not automatically produce a wholesale secession of the entire following. Perhaps this might have been the case had the Episcopal Puritan group been tightly organized. But as a matter of fact, the party was vague and amorphous in the extreme. Unlike the centralized and politically conscious Puritan party in London, Episcopal Puritanism seems to have lacked even the most rudimentary forms of organization, and as a consequence, was more a widely diffused opinion than a party. Because of this the history of the secession of the Episcopal Puritans cannot end with the defection of the faction's intellectual leaders. "There are (no question)," lamented Ussher, "many which follow them, and do really intend the advancement of religion, going after tham, as many did after Absalom, in the simplicity of their hearts."[37]

---

[33] In the autumn of 1641, Dering could say in the house: "M. Speaker, there is a certaine new-born, un-seen, ignorant, dangerous, desperate way of Independency. Are we Sir, for this independent way? Nay, (Sir) are we for the elder brother of it, the Presbyterial form? I have not yet heard any one Gentleman within these walls stand up and assert his thoughts here for either of those waies" (Dering, p. 99).

[34] Baillie, I, 287. [35] *Ibid.*, p. 298. [36] *Ibid.*, p. 303.

The leaders of the party organization were quick to take advantage of this lack of organization among the Episcopal Puritans, and they carefully took steps to retain the allegiance of the rank and file. Thus, a number of Puritan ministers of secondary importance who had strong leanings toward episcopacy--men like Twisse, Gataker, Gouge, Temple, and Palmer--continued to work with the party leaders. The greatest conquest in this regard, of course, was Burges himself, who, despite his being "too much Episcopall" for the Scots,[38] continued to guide the party albeit with decreasing influence. Perhaps the most important measure in maintaining the adherence of the Episcopal Puritans to the party was the supposed moderation of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance. From what we know of the content of this document, it seems clear that no demand for the outright abolition of bishops was made. Rather it was a program for the drastic limitation of the prerogatives of episcopacy. All the indications are that the petition was largely a mere concession to Episcopal feeling and that the strategy of the party heads was to proceed gradually toward the ultimate end of root-and-branch.[39]

---

[37] Works of James Ussher, I, 240.

[38] Baillie, I, 302-303.

What is even more significant, however, is that even after this guise was thrown off for a frankly root-and-branch policy, many Episcopal Puritans clung to the party on the theory that the old church was being swept away merely so a new reformed church could be built without any trace of compromise. Even in the first year of the Long Parliament there seems to have been an understanding that the religious settlement would be left to a free and open assembly of orthodox clergy, and the possibility that the church might retain some form of episcopacy was always carefully left open. Faith in this arrangement was widespread, and the belief was made easier by the fact that many of the root-and-branch parliament members spoke approvingly of moderate episcopal government. Dering, who introduced the Root and Branch Bill in the commons, made this Episcopal Puritan position perfectly clear:

> In short and plaine English, I am for abolishing of our present Episcopacy. Both Diocesses and Diocesan, as now they are. But I am withal (at the same time) for restauration of the pure Primitive Episcopal Presidency . . . . . Downe then with our Prelaticall Hierarchy . . . . . This doe, but *ea lege*, on this condition, that with the same hand, in the same Bill we doe gently raise againe (even from under the ruines of that Babel) such an Episcopacy, such a Presidency, as is venerable in its antiquity and purity, and most behoovefull for the peace of our Christendome.[40]

At the time these words were spoken, Dering had already begun to see the light, but others were not so quick. As late as 1644, Edwards, after noting that many Episcopal Puritans had fixed their names to the moderate Ministers' Petition, could add, "And there are many Parliament men and ministers, who have a great zeale to the present Reformation in casting out the Hierarchy and Ceremonies, who are not yet convinced that all their former practise in the way of old conformity was sinfull."[41] It does not seem unlikely that many Episcopal Puritans maintained their loyalty to the party far into the Civil War period, and we have the evidence of Baxter that "Thousands that wished for Good Bishops were on the Parliaments side."[42]

---

[39] *Ibid*., p. 308

[40] Dering, pp. 76-77; Rushworth, IV, 296.

Though surprisingly successful, this strategy to retain the allegiance of the Episcopal Puritans could not prevent the steady rise of discontent as an increasing tendency toward Presbyterianism manifested itself in the party. The very situation of the bitter struggle in parliament over the retention of episcopacy was such as to awaken in Episcopal Puritans grave doubts as to the wisdom of the root-and-branch campaign. The growing unease was reflected in the rise in the house of a strong Episcopal party which was able to temper many of the harsh religious sections of the Grand Remonstrance. Perhaps the most striking instance of the changing temper was the about-face of Sir Edward Dering. Dering had probably been tricked into introducing the Root and Branch Bill into the commons to attract Episcopal Puritan votes, which, as a matter of fact, went heavily in favor of the bill at the division.[43] But after his failure to get a provision for the establishment of godly episcopacy attached to the bill, he evidently saw which way things were heading and rapidly became a bitter enemy of the "rooters."

The rising demand for a more conservative church policy was becoming more prominent throughout 1641 and 1642. The houses began to be besieged with petitions urging religious reformation rather than revolution, even though, as one member wrote, "all art is used to keepe petitions for Episcopacy from being presented to the House."[44] The Kentish petition expressed the general complaint of most of these Anglican Puritans when it implored the house "both in the Church Government and in our present Liturgie, to give us a severe Reformation, not an absolute Innovation."[45] Numbers of the clergy too began to look askance at the increasing radicalism of the parliament's church policy. These ministers evidently began to complain to parliament men, and in October of 1641 Sir Edward Dering could remark,

---

[41] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 15.

[42] Reliquiae Baxterianae, Part I, p. 31.

[43] Shaw, I, 79.

> Many mournfull sad complaints I have of late received from Ministers the ablest and every way the worthiest that I know . . . . . Men upon whose merit, let my credit stand or fall in this house. He that hath preached least of these hath preached severall thousands of excellent sermons to his people.[46]

All this growing disaffection and the failure of the party to respond to it produced the inevitable result. Quietly and unobtrusively, individual Puritans throughout the nation were rethinking their positions and gradually falling away into neutrality or even active royalism. Within the inner circle of party leadership a heated (though hardly a crucial) debate seems to have been precipitated by Dering's defection, and we are told that Stephen Marshall insisted on the abolition of episcopacy and liturgy with the words, "If you take not off this burden also, it wil be girded upon us closer and stronger then ever."[47] The alienation of Dering was the greatest blow the party received in this crisis. Refusing to co-operate with the party any longer and spurning the efforts of the large number of influential party leaders who by writing and debate attempted to regain him, he strove to undo the consequences of his former zeal.[48] A fine insight into the passionate enmity which these divisions within Puritanism excited is given us in an eloquent passage of conversation between Dering and a root-and-branch man shortly after the former had been expelled from the commons. Enraged by the debate, Dering cried out,

---

[44] Journal of D'Ewes from First Recess of Long Parliament, p. 290, n. 3, quoting, Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report XII, Part II, p. 295.

[45] Proceedings in Kent, p. 61. [46] Dering, p. 93.

[47] Ibid., p. 165. I have assumed that "S.M." signifies Stephen Marshall.

> It will not be long . . . . before all this mountayn of endeavour to root out Episcopacy, and to abolish our Liturgy, will fall downe, ly still and stinke, and shame the endeavourers thereof . . . . . And I will never cease, by word, by writing, and by prayer, to oppose itt: and thus I begin; God confounde thy purposes, and the way thou goest. God confounde the way the house goes.[49]

With such strength of feeling characterizing the Episcopal Puritans, it is not surprising that the king was able to gather around him numbers of those who in 1640 had been among the most vehement in denouncing the rule of Laud and his associates.

The last scenes in the alienation of the Episcopal Puritans took place in the Westminster Assembly--a stage on which a much more momentous schism was soon to develop. Most of the leading Episcopal Puritan divines were invited to attend, the chief among them being Brownrig, Ward, Featly, Holdsworth, and Ussher. Only a few of these actually attended the first session of the Assembly, and even these, apprehending that "their business was to pull down that which they would uphold,"[50] soon withdrew and attached themselves to the king's party. To be sure, Featly remained for a time, but in a short while he too was disposed of. According to Clarendon, a trap was laid for him whereby his correspondence with

---

[48] *Ibid.*, pp. 162-165. [49] *Proceedings in Kent*, p. 74.

[50] Neal, III, 49.

Ussher was betrayed with the result that he was thrown in prison and his estate sequestered.[51] Many of the rank and file of the Episcopal Puritans and those who were committed to the party organization continued their attendance at the Assembly, and "Dr. Burges, the Prolocutor, Mr. Gataker, and abundance more declared their Judgments to be for Episcopacy, even for the ancient moderate Episcopacy."[52] Moreover, these men continued to insist that the door be left open to Episcopal Puritanism, and it is interesting to see that Burges was so insistent in this regard that he was expelled from the house for a time.[53] But the very fact that Burges was expelled from the house indicated that among the supporters of the parliament Episcopal Puritanism was fast losing all place of honor or influence.

The tragedy of the Puritan Reformation was that though it began with the support of almost the entire nation, it was obliged to renounce section after section of this support as it went on its way toward erecting the national church. The alienation of the Episcopal Puritans was the first of the successive secessions which finally left the Presbyterian Establishment with very little backing. Though hardly so dramatic or spectacular as later schisms, it was by far the most important in point of numbers. "It's certainlie true," crowed Baillie in 1644,

> what yow wrote, of the impossibilitie ever to have gotten England reformed by humane means, as things here stood, without their brethrens help; The learndest and most considerable part of them were fullie Episcopall; of these who joyned with the Parliament, the greatest and most countenanced part were much Episcopall; . . . . but God hes so guided it, that all hes contribute for the maine work.[54]

---

[51] Clarendon, IV, 276-278.

[52] _Reliquiae Baxterianae_, Part I, pp. 48-49.

[53] _The Whole Works of the Late Rev. John Lightfoot, D.D._, ed. John Rogers Pitman, XIII (London: G. Cowie and Co., 1825), 10-12.

[54] Baillie, II, 250.

But even while Baillie wrote armies were clashing in England over the question of reformation or innovation. "Alas," Sir Edward Dering had said to a more radical Puritan in 1641, "the burning of my booke cannot confute me, nor silence me in the way I go. Itt is not in the power of the house to confute me, though you should burn me with my booke."[55] The commons and the Assembly were learning that parliamentary triumphs only pushed the ecclesiastical struggle into a wider arena.

III

Long before the Episcopal Puritans had completely turned away from the Puritan party, a new menace, far more serious, had threatened to ruin the cause of reformation. Independency, though regarded by most as a radical and somewhat dangerous innovation, was not altogether recent in its origin. Rather, with regard to its full consciousness of itself as a party within the church, it was older than either Episcopal or Presbyterian Puritanism. It bore its similarities with the sectarian movement inaugurated by Robert Browne, though the churches of this movement were exceedingly few in number and could never have posed any problem to the bulk of the Puritan party. The real explanation of the appearance in force of a full-blown Independency after 1640--a fact which used to delight though mystify the older Congregational historians--is to be found in the fact that the established church harbored within itself a strong party of non-separating Congregationalists. These Puritans, though they restricted church membership to the elect and insisted on the autonomy of the individual congregation, professed to hold their sectarian brethren in abhorrence. Rather they maintained, by means of a rather elaborate and casuistic argument, that the Church of England was a true church and her ministers true ministers, and that the true Christian's course was reformation not separation.[56]

---

[55] Proceedings in Kent, p. 75.

The non-separating Congregationalists had arisen in the reign of James and by the time of Charles they had become strong though small in numbers. The movement seems to have attracted many of the most intelligent and enterprising natures in Puritanism. Very early in its history, Independency had developed a party consciousness and a party leadership to carry out the very ambitious undertakings which it sponsored. Thus, there came to be something in the nature of a party within a party as the Independent leadership began to emerge out of Puritanism. In all likelihood, the existence of the new faction was at first only dimly perceived, and for a while no friction developed. But as the Independents began launching exclusively Congregational enterprises such as the English classis in Holland and the colonization of Massachusetts Bay it was inevitable that a cleavage should appear between them and their fellow-Puritans.

Prior to 1640 there was little opportunity for this enmity to grow in England. There all men of Puritan convictions were engaged in a life and death struggle with Laudian prelacy, and it was ridiculous to foster disagreements within Puritanism while so great a danger threatened it from without. The point at which the potential friction between Independency and the Presbyterian tradition within Puritanism became active was wherever Puritans were free to build a Puritan church. Such was the case, for instance, in Massachusetts where Congregationalist dominance early stifled all tendencies in the direction of Presbyterianism. It was in the Low Countries, however, that real bitterness first developed. There the struggle between the English Congregational Classis and the Presbyterian John Paget who sought the aid of his colleagues in the Dutch Reformed Church became extremely heated.[57] This civil strife was, of course, welcome to Anglicans, and Stephen Goffe happily reported that "the sport is that the puritans are at pittiful warres amongst themselves, those which will not have a classis (which are the best part) against them which will have one."[58] Most ominous for the future, however, was the warning which Hugh Peter sounded when Paget had succeeded in embroiling John Davenport in trouble with the Dutch Reformed ministers. "Take heed, Mr. D., what you do," he wrote to Davenport, "for you were as good yeeld to the English Bishops as to the Dutch Classis."[59]

---

[56] Miller, pp. 73-101.

Reverberations of these quarrels could not but be heard in England, and they must have produced the seeds of hostility between the Independents and their pro-Presbyterian brethren. Moreover, the rivalry which immediately became active on the meeting of the Long Parliament only further widened the breech. As a result, by the time the Independent exiles returned from America and the Low Lands there was very little of the spirit of fraternity or co-operation between the two groups. The Presbyterians seem to have welcomed the returning ministers rather coldly as men who had taken their ease abroad while they had been suffering at home. Fuller catches the spirit in which the Independents were greeted when he tells us that "over they came in a very good plight and equipage, which the Presbyterians (and those, I assure you, are quick-sighted when pleased to pry) took notice of. 'Not a hair of their head sing-ed, nor any smell of the fire' of persecution 'upon their clothes!'"[60] In all probability, the Independents also were partially responsible for the growing division, for they came back in an aggressive mood, determined to take steps "for the settling the right form of church discipline there."[61]

---

[57] Stearns, pp. 27-30; 63-69.

[58] _Ibid_., p. 60; _Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I_, Vol. VIII (1635), p. 28.

[59] Stearns, pp. 66-67.

The situation in England, however, did not yet permit the two factions to indulge or nourish their mutual enmity. For months after the opening of the Long Parliament, the attention of the whole Puritan community was directed against the Arminian element in the established church, and civil conflicts within the movement were a luxury which they could not then afford. As a result, that curious working agreement--the Engagement--was made whereby the two factions undertook to co-operate in pulling down the old church and to leave their differences to be settled at a later time. We have already noted in the letters of Baillie the actual steps by which the alliance was established. Conversations were held in December, January, and February of 1640-41, and by March 15, Baillie could write home that full agreement had been reached:

> Anent private meetings, we know here no difference we have with anie: Our questions with them of the newway, we hope to get determined to our mutuall satisfaction, if we were ridd of Bishops; and till then, we have agreed to speak nothing of any thing wherein we differ.[62]

Despite the rapidity with which agreement was reached, the alliance was necessarily unstable. It is apparent that each side entered into the alliance only by reason of the necessity of the moment, and that the inevitable struggle between the two was only postponed. Thomas Edwards tells us that he and a party of his fellow-Presbyterians vehemently opposed the Engagement since it would give the Independents a chance to build up their party,[63] and a similar spirit of intransigeance doubtless animated many of the Independents. Moreover, the facts that the Independents refused to act against the sects[64] and that Nye carried off the Presbyterians' copy of the Engagement[65] subjected the alliance to a severe tension from the very beginning. Only the pressure of the common enemy seems to have prevented the early outbreak of strife. This was freely admitted by the Independents in their composite manifesto, An Apologeticall Narration. They had had, they maintained, many provocations to schism, but had been prevented by "the sad and conscientious apprehension of the danger of rending and dividing the godly Protestant party in this Kingdome that were desirous of Reformation . . . . in a time when there was an absolute necessity of their neerest union and conjunction, and all little enough to effect that Reformation intended, and so long contended for, against a common adversary."[66] This prudential character of the alliance is again brought out when we learn that it was the politically minded Puritan laymen that vigorously insisted upon it; for according to the Independents there was constant pressure "by the instant and continuall advices and conjurements of many Honourable, wise and godly Personages of both Houses of Parliament, to forbeare what might any way be like to occasion or augment this unhappy difference."[67]

---

[60] Fuller, Church History, III, 465. Cf. Edwards, Antapologia, p. 2.

[61] Miller, p. 276, quoting John Winthrop, History of New England, or Journal, ed. James Kendall Hosmer (New York, 1908), II, 31. The instructions were given to Weld and Peter when they left New England. Cf. Edwards, Antapologia, p. 221.

[62] Baillie, I, 311.

Considering how tenuous the unity between the two factions was, it is surprising that the alliance could last as long and work as well as it did. It lasted throughout the attack on the old church and even for a time after the new Establishment had begun to be constructed. That this was so was due primarily to the fact that after the beginning of the Westminster Assembly in 1643, each party found it wise to compromise for a time. One cannot say that this was entirely dictated by self-interest, for all men seem to have been earnestly and genuinely desirous of religious unity, though many were unwilling to make any concession for its sake. But on the whole, it was the hope of both Presbyterians and Independents that delay would increase their strength that temporarily averted schism. To the Presbyterians the truce gave time to accustom England to the idea of the Presbyterian discipline. As Baillie wrote home, it had been wise "to eschew a publick rupture with the Independents, till we were more able for them. As yet a Presbytrie to this people is conceaved to be a strange monster."[68] Moreover, the hope of Scottish assistance was strong, and Baillie rather smugly declared that "we purpose not to medle in haste, till it please God to advance our armie, which we expect will much assist our arguments."[69] On their side, the Independents were grateful for the time to build up their backing in the nation. In 1640 they were still rather small in number, and therefore the next two years saw a vigorous proselytizing campaign and a tremendous growth of gathered churches.[70]

---

[63] Edwards, Antapologia, pp. 241-242.

[64] Ibid., pp. 242-243. [65] Ibid., p. 243.

[66] Apologeticall Narration, pp. 25-26. [67] Ibid.

But all during these three years and more of truce, Presbyterians and Independents were feverishly girding for battle. The preparations were always kept decently covered, and outward fraternity, much of it doubtless sincere, was carefully maintained. But both parties seem to have realized that a permanent accommodation might well be difficult to obtain, and hence they prepared for the worst. Thus, underlying all the attempts toward religious unity was a will to schism--or at least a will to court schism--on the part of both parties. Baillie's intransigent attitude has already been referred to. To him, "it were all the pities in the world that we and they should differ in anie thing," but he was unshaken in his conviction that the toleration of Independency would plunge the church into "unspeakable confusions."[71] Perhaps the most revealing statement of how the Presbyterian irreconcilables would settle the problem was expressed in Thomas Edwards's preface to his tract against Independency, already published in 1641. His contribution, he tells us, "for the healing of this schisme, and quenching this fire" is "this present Treatise against Independant Government, and the Toleration of it."[72] At the same time, the Independents also nurtured an unwillingness to compromise. To be sure, their position was not such as to permit them to speak as loudly and as threateningly as the Presbyterians. As the weaker party, they protested their desire for compromise or toleration. Nevertheless, they were laboring to build up their strength in England by gathering churches and effecting conversions, and even Edwards was obliged to confess that "by your presence and your politick way of working, and the strong streame of popular applause running that way, some few Ministers, uncertaine, heady, inconstant, wanton-witted men, are since come off to your way."[73] All these efforts, of course, were to build up a strong Congregational communion throughout the nation so that when the

---

[68] Baillie, II, 117. [69] *Ibid*., p. 111.

[70] *Ibid*., p. 243.

---

[71] _Ibid_., I, 311.

[72] Edwards, _Reasons against the Independent Government_, "The Epistle Dedicatory," unpaged.

[73] Edwards, _Antapologia_, p. 192.

Presbyterians came to set up the new Establishment they would be presented with a fait accompli. This may have been good Independent strategy, but it was a strategy that made schism inevitable.

Both parties attempted to build up their strength for the approaching struggle in a variety of ways. First of all, each seems to have carried on a campaign to win large sections of the population to the Presbyterian or Independent systems. Here the task of the Presbyterians was the easier of the two since the bulk of the clergy and the more conservative Puritan laity were already inclined toward that polity. The Independents had a much more difficult problem since they were definitely a minority in 1640. Nevertheless, they set about to remedy this situation, and aided by the ever increasing religious ferment, did very considerably improve their condition. Much of this had to be carried on more or less clandestinely, but the Presbyterians were certain that the Independents had worked in a very frenzy of activity. "I am perswaded," wrote Edwards, "(that, setting aside the Jesuits acting for themselves and way) you five have acted . . . . upon the stage and behind the curtain . . . . more than any five men have done in so short a time this 60 yeares."[74] In large measure, the growth of Congregationalism was brought about by preaching and publishing. Here again, the Independent leaders were handicapped by the necessity of keeping up the show of friendship with the Presbyterians, but apparently they found a way of spreading their message by innuendo. "You have vented your principles and opinions," charged Edwards, "by preaching, sometimes more generally and covertly, (yet so as your followers understand you,) and sometimes particularly and plainly."[75] And if they prudently refrained from entering the press warfare, it seems likely that they had "a hand in perusing and examining some books of others, or in counselling and consenting to the printing of them."[76]

---

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 221. [75] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

It was perfectly natural that both Presbyterians and Independents should attempt to win the mass of the Puritan community to their own particular brand of Puritanism. But in addition--and it is here that the break in the Puritan party really becomes evident--both began to strengthen their organizations, to cultivate the parliament men, and in general to build up their political influence as much as possible. Here again the Presbyterians had the advantage, for they retained control of the old Puritan party organization with its shrewd leadership and influential connections. Moreover, these weapons, already demonstrated to be so effective against episcopacy, were now employed to advance Presbyterianism. Anyone who reads the pages of Baillie cannot but be struck by the manner in which everything was manipulated. Frequently there were "privie conferences with the speciall men" in and out of the Assembly;[77] sympathetic commons members such as Francis Rous conferred with Presbyterian leaders like Baillie and Marshall, and even disclosed what was going on in the closed committee of the house;[78] letters were dispatched to the Continent that the Reformed churches might return "unsolicited" replies condemning "that democratick anarchy and independence of particular congregations";[79] or messages to Scotland "desyreing a letter from them to us for putting us to more speed, in such tearms as we might show it to the Assembly";[80] and within the Assembly care was always taken that leading Presbyterians were given the key positions on committees and even in preaching and praying. Thus, no effort was neglected to invest the Presbyterian party with the same smooth operation which had served so well in the fight against episcopacy.

---

[76] Ibid., p. 220. [77] Baillie, II, 130-131.

[78] Ibid., pp. 198-199. [79] Ibid., p. 115. [80] Ibid., p. 131.

But the Independents were also adept at political manoeuvering. For a number of years the Independents had already been tightly organized, and this internal unity was of inestimable value in the struggle against Presbyterianism. Apparently by 1643 the Independent leaders had regular meetings to determine the strategy for their party, for Edwards asked rhetorically:

> Whether have not you, out of acting for your selves and way, had many meetings and consultations both of writing letters into New-England for their help and furtherance, and about what you should doe, and how to order matters since the Scots must be sent for, and since the Assembly could not be hindered, how things might be managed and carried for the best advantage of your cause and way? and whether was not this Apologeticall Narration one of the Products of your consultations?[81]

Coming from a Presbyterian who was considerably "active" himself, this criticism falls a little flat. But what distressed Edwards was that he perceived in these party conclaves that the Independents, unlike the Episcopal Puritans, were politically mature and that victory over the Congregationalists was to be a matter of some difficulty.

The political influence of the Independents was strengthened by their guidance in worldly affairs by a shrewd and diplomatic divine--Philip Nye. In character, Nye seems to have been a counterpart or sort of younger edition of his father-in-law, Stephen Marshall. One contemporary found him "jesuitical," and even a fellow-Congregationalist complained that he insisted on being consulted on every matter, and "if he disliked, would hinder it."[82] Certainly he had a certain flair for political intrigues, and his reputation was such that at the Restoration "it was debated in council for several hours, whether he (with John Goodwin and Hugh Peters) should be excepted for life."[83] Like the other Dissenting Brethren, he had been a minister in Holland, and after his return in 1640 he quickly rose to leadership of the Independents in their party activities. With the great Puritan peers he was on intimate terms, and it was perhaps through these contacts that he had, as the younger Calamy declared, "a great concern in choosing the members of the Assembly of divines."[84]

---

[81] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 224.

[82] Alexander Gordon, "Philip Nye," DNB, Vol. XIV.

Like all the other parties concerned in the settlement of religion, the Independents were driven to plead their cause with the parliament. Here the Independents never succeeded in making much progress, partly because Scottish aid was so imperative a necessity and partly because the Erastian tendencies of the legislature were satisfied by the diluted Presbyterianism which finally received state sanction. The failure of the Independents to win any considerable party in parliament was a constant consolation to the Presbyterians, and on more than one occasion Baillie rejoices to the effect that "no man I know, in either of the Houses, of any note, is for them."[85] This was going a little far; Say and Brooke and Vane and Cromwell were not exactly men of no note. Baillie himself recognized this a number of years later when he wrote that "the Independent partie, albeit their number in the Parliament be very small," yet they were "prime men, active and diligent."[86] But though the Independents might gain a small party in parliament, they never succeeded in swaying that body, and their main strength always remained outside parliament.

Though they were not destined to achieve lasting success, the Independents nevertheless made every effort to influence the houses. Like the Presbyterians, they soon learned the trick of waiting upon the members at the parliament house to lobby for their party. Edwards with his usual indignation noted this and deplored "how diligently and close they follow it, by daily attending at Westminster, by insinuating themselves into the company of sundry members of the House of Commons, by preaching often in Westminster, the more to ingratiate themselves and their cause."[87] The written covenent for a mutual silence--"and especially with Parliament men"--must have been frequently disregarded, for the Independents were constantly charged with "tampering" with members,[88] "earnestly dealing" with them,[89] and "mooving" them.[90] Edwards bitterly acknowledged this success sometime later in his conclusion that "there are but few Ministers of the Assembly, who have been able to doe more with them then you."[91] As might be expected, Nye as the Independents' most effective politician was subjected to severe reproof for having "acted the State-parasite, and played the politician, the more, and dealing in private, under hand, and hand to hand with some men of note for the Church-way, and against the government of the Church of Scotland."[92] It was not long, moreover, before this persistance at Westminster was given a sound basis by the discovery of a wedge which might be driven between parliament and the Presbyterians. As the revolution wore on and especially after the Westminster Assembly had begun to meet, parliamentary Erastianism bloomed very rapidly. Quick to seize upon this potential cleavage, the Independents played upon the laymen's fear of a "pope in every parish." At first, this was necessarily done sub rosa, but after the split the Independents developed the argument fully and publicly.

---

[83] Edmund Calamy, The Nonconformist's Memorial (London: Button and son, and T. Hurst, 1802-1803), I, 96.

[84] *Ibid.* [85] Baillie, II, 146. [86] *Ibid.*, p. 336.

---

[87] Edwards, Reasons against the Independent Government, "The Introduction," unpaged.

[88] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 224. [89] Ibid.

[90] Ibid., pp. 220-221. [91] Ibid., p. 257.

[92] Ibid., p. 217.

All these activities on the part of both Presbyterians and Independents produced an atmosphere in which the dreaded schism found it easy to thrive. The stage was fully set, and it needed only a burning issue to precipitate the split. The mounting suspicion and rivalry so poisoned the situation that all future attempts at moderate compromises were to have very ill success. Even so, the formal break was very slow and gradual in coming. This was due to a number of causes. First of all, there was a very real dread of schism, not only because it would destroy the unity of the church, but also because it would enfeeble the future Establishment and give free reign to the sects. Even the intransigent Baillie could write, "We doubt not to carrie all . . . . but if we carie not the Independents with us, there will be ground laid for a verie troublesome schisme. Alwayes it's our care to use our outmost endeavour to prevent that dangerous [evil]."[93] As a result of this feeling, there was a sort of general agreement to avoid or at least postpone the more controversial issues as far as possible. Almost immediately after the Assembly opened, this understanding was given a trial, for Lightfoot who had moved for a definition of the church tells us "my motion was waved as being too sudden a trial of the differences in opinion that are like to shew among us."[94] Thus, there developed what may be called a policy of temporary compromise whereby the effort was made to define the things agreeable before the differences were explored. "In the meantime, wrote Baillie,

> we would assay to agree upon the Directorie of Worship,

---

[93] Baillie, II, 122.

[94] Works of John Lightfoot, XIII, 20.

> wherein we expect no small help from these men to abolish the great Idol of England, the Service-Book, and to erect in all the parts of worship a full conformitie to Scotland . . . . . Haveing proponed thir motions in the ears of some of the cheiffe of the Assemblie and Parliament, (but [except] in a tacit way all had been spoyled) they were well taken.[95]

Further earnest of the measured co-operation between Presbyterians and Independents was given in the same month, December, 1643. On this occasion, Marshall drew up a declaration "in the name of the cheefe men of the Assemblie, and the chief of the Independents" exhorting the people to wait patiently for the settling of religion and asking them to desist from gathering congregations--a paper which Baillie disliked because it gave "too much countenance to these who had gathered congregations, and favour more than needed to the Independents."[96] This policy of temporary compromise seems to have been furthered as far as possible by Marshall, who after 1643 took a moderate position (thereby disgusting Baillie) and attempted to mediate between the two parties. Forces were on foot, however, which even Marshall count not stay, and even in the things supposedly agreeable strangely jarring notes were struck. Perhaps the factor that was most potent in postponing the schism was the Independents' strategy itself. Knowing that they had no chance of carrying the Assembly, the Dissenting Brethren adopted the tactics of obstruction and delay. "Indeed it's marked by all," declared Baillie, "that to the uttermost of their power hitherto they have studied procrastination of all things, finding that by tyme they gained."[97] To be sure, this strategy was dictated by party considerations but it nevertheless served to prevent an immediate open break.

Yet gradual and halting as it was, the split could not be forestalled forever. The Independents had had ample opportunity to see that the Presbyterians were not disposed to make any major concessions in their direction. Even as far back as July, 1641, the Presbyterians had openly declared war by informing the Scottish General Assembly that since God had "raised our hopes of removing this yoke of Episcopacy . . . . sundry other formes of Church-government are by sundry sorts of men projected to be set up in the room thereof" and by asking their advice on the problem.[98] As the weaker party, the Independents seem to have felt obliged to sabotage their alliance with the Presbyterians even more seriously. Edwards, at least, found no difficulty in compiling a long list of provocations. Shortly after the Dissenting Brethren arrived in England, they consulted together and drew up a petition "to be presented to the House of Commons for a Toleration of some Congregations to enjoy a Congregationall government."[99] Apparently, it was deemed unwise to present this petition, but a short time later when the debates on the Root and Branch Bill were taking place, no such inhibitions were felt. At that time, as we have already noted, the vociferous objections of the Independents constituted one factor in the abandonment of the scheme for semi-Presbyterian commissions.[100] One of the most crucial tests came on the Solemn League and Covenant. Though not without a few loopholes, the Covenant in a general manner committed England to Presbyterianism, and it is understandable that the Brethren "had much adoe to bring themselves to take it, and that it was a bitter pill to get downe."[101] Nye attended the English mission to Edinburgh, and probably did his best to strengthen English resistance to the Scottish demands. In the end, however, he apparently was convinced that the Covenant had to be accepted and wrote "with all earnestnesse and possible Conjurements to M^r^ Goodwin, M^r^ Bridge, &c. not to oppose it, or be against it, as much fearing how it would goe downe."[102] The depth of this Congregational hostility to Presbyterianism was perhaps most fully displayed in the efforts of the Brethren to prevent or at least postpone the meetings of the Westminster Assembly. No reformation was better than a Presbyterian reformation.

---

[95] Baillie, II, 117.

[96] _Ibid_., pp. 118, 121. [97] _Ibid_., p. 122.

---

[98] David Masson, The Life of John Milton: Narrated in Connexion with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of His Time (London: Macmillan and Co., 1859-1896), II, 288.

[99] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 221.

[100] See above, chap. viii; Edwards, Antapologia, p. 222.

These clashes in the policies of the two factions found reflection in quarrels between individual ministers. Despite constant protestations of friendship and a real mutual regard, the spirit of fraternity rapidly seems to have worn thin. The Independents complained in the Apologeticall Narration that "good men" had threatened them with banishment.[103] The Presbyterians, it is interesting to note, did not deny the charge but rather made counter-charges. "You have given as good as was brought you, and have bid them doe their worst, you doubted not but by your friends to make your part good, and that you had as many for your way, as they."[104] The indications are that at times these mutual recriminations became quite bitter. Independents were accused of asserting "they had rather have Episcopacie then Presbyterie," while one minister even went so far as to say that he "preferred Popery in this Kingdome before Presbyterie, for if Popery should come in, it would be but short lived, but

---

[101] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 285. [102] Ibid.

[103] Apologeticall Narration, p. 31.

[104] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 274.

Presbyterie was like to be long lived."[105] In such words as these it is clear that the split in the Puritan party was already accomplished as far as the thoughts and attitudes of the members were concerned.

Thus, even before the Assembly had really begun to work the spiritual schism between the two groups had manifested itself in public and private expressions of hostility. Once the Assembly convened, these expressions became all the more frequent. "At our first coming," noted Baillie, "we found them in a verie sharp debaite,"[106] and this tension was to characterize the majority of the sessions. Finally, by the end of 1643, the Independents saw clearly that there was no hope of obtaining satisfaction in the Assembly, while the growth of the sects and the new element of toleration was widening the breach between the two communions. Despairing of ever securing either concessions or toleration, and conscious that their delaying tactics could be only temporarily effective, the Brethren decided on a bold step. They went over the heads of the Assembly and appealed to the parliament in their Apologeticall Narration. Of this move Baillie gave a full account:

> The Independents, holding of with long weapons, and debaiting all things too prolixlie which come within twentie myles to their quarters, were taken up sundrie times, somewhat sharplie, both by Divines and Parliament-men . . . . . At last, foreseeing they behooved, ere long, to come to the point, they put out in print, on a sudden, ane Apologeticall Narration of their way, which long had lyen readie beside them, wherein they petition the Parliament, in a most slie and cunning way, for a tolleration.[107]

With this manifesto, formal and overt recognition was given to the fact that the Great Puritan Split had already taken place.

It is difficult to over-emphasize the importance of the Apologeticall Narration. To be sure, the two wings of the Puritan party had ceased to work with any whole-hearted co-operation since episcopacy had ceased to be an issue. But with the publication of the Narration, all pretense that the quarrel was something which could be amicably settled within the Puritan clerical community was necessarily abandoned. The Independent leaders very consciously repudiated the yet unmade decisions of the Assembly and carried the problem to the nation at large. By these tactics, the finality of the polity decided on by the assembly was thus impugned in advance. This does not mean that the Independents alone must be credited with the schism nor that all efforts at accommodation ceased with the publication of the tract. On the contrary, the history of the Assembly was just beginning, and the Presbyterian-Congregational controversy was to continue at the center of the stage for at least the next two years. Marshall, perhaps the most astute and far-seeing as well as the most experienced of the clerical politicians, quickly set to work to repair the gap. Even before the Narration reached the public Marshall was acting the part of a peace-maker, and when Goodwin and Burges exchanged heated words, "Mr. Marshall composed all so well as he could."[108] Attempting to save the situation, he apparently lent his prestige and diplomacy to building up a compromise party. Thus, by September of the next year the irreconcilable Baillie could write that "Marshall miskens us altogether; he is for a middle way of his own, and draws a faction in the synod to give ordination and excommunication to congregations, albeit dependentlie, in case of mal-administration."[109] But already it was too late. Both factions had committed themselves to programs from which they could not respectably retreat. Indeed, by no pretense could one still speak of a "Puritan party" among the clergy. The party was rent in two, and the cleavage did not stop there but extended through the parliament and the nation. Edwards spoke sage words when he declared that the Apologeticall Narration, "though it be not on your parts the beginning of strife, yet it will prove as the breaking in of waters and as the kindling of a fire not likely to be put out in haste."[110]

---

[105] *Ibid.*, p. 279. [106] Baillie, II, 110.

[107] *Ibid.*, pp. 129-130.

---

[108] Ibid., p. 122. [109] Ibid., pp. 230-231.

Within a few months--we are not certain exactly when--the break was formally acknowledged in the Company of Ministers. In their Apologeticall Narration, the Independents had excused their conduct in publishing the tract on the grounds that the Engagement was terminable at will.[111] Edwards refused to admit the excuse, and insisted that though the agreement was to continue "but ad placitum," yet "it was agreed upon, it should continue till both sides in a full meeting did declare the contrary."[112] However the case may have been, this neglected detail was soon remedied. Sometime between the first of the year and the summer of 1644 when Antapologia was published, the assembled ministers issued a "formall Declaration of the Companie in a publike meeting, that the agreement ceased, and that every man was left to his former libertie."[113] Thus was written the epitaph of the united Puritan party. The quarrel was to engage the attention of the Assembly for two years more, but as a struggle between two churches rather than a civil conflict within the united organization.

The explanation of the Great Puritan Split must be sought in the fact that Puritanism was consonant with--indeed it tended to give birth to--a wide variety of opinion on ecclesiastical polity. Thomas Goodwin in his words to the commons gave a faithful but unwitting description of the mentality of the fragmentation process in which he himself was so immersed.

---

[110] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 236.

[111] Apologeticall Narration, p. 26.

[112] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 239.

[113] Ibid., pp. 240, 242.

> There is a Spirit . . . . even the Holy Ghost, who will not rest working in mens spirits, till the whole building be rightly framed according to the pattern in every piece of it. And what ever is amisse, and not according to his minde, the light of his fire will both discover it and burne it up.[114]

The variety of opinions on the "pattern," each invested with absolute, divine authority, could not but conflict in such a manner as to make concession a synonym for infidelity. Thus, any attempt toward the harmonious erection of a Puritan church was doomed to complete failure.

Already the disintegration of Puritanism had progressed beyond the stage of Congregationalism. With this development, a new factor entered upon the scene which made accommodation even more remote. Immediately after the release of the Apologeticall Narration and even before, the ever increasing sects had rallied to the banner of Independency and toleration. As a result, the Dissenting Brethren found themselves forced by the more radical wing of their support to take up a position of unalterable opposition to bigoted Presbyterian jurisdiction. With this development, the sects had begun to play an important role in the final disintegration of the Puritan party.

IV

"Every one," declared Thomas Edwards in an epistle to the parliament,

> minds you by Petitions, Sermons, Bookes, concerning the Reformation of this Church, in Government, Ministery, Ceremonies, and worship; and God forbid that a word

---

[114] Thomas Goodwin, Zevbbabels Encovragement to Finish the Temple (London: Francis Eglesfield, 1642), p. 44.

> should ever fall from my mouth, or pen draw a line, to call you off from it . . . . . But amidst all your care and paines in this kinde, I beseech you cast an eye upon the errors and evills of the other hand, as Anabaptisme, Brownisme, &c. . . . . . Any man who hath but halfe an Eye in his head, and observes the course of things may see that errors on the right hand are now coming on the stage to take their turne also.[115]

The discernment which Edwards shows in this passage is quite remarkable since it was written in 1641 at the height of the struggle against episcopacy. Yet already he could see that "Satan for this time hath even done with errors on the left hand, and their time is going out," but that the danger from the ever increasing sectaries was just beginning.[116] To be sure, the sects were nothing new. They had managed a precarious existence on the periphery of English religion since the Reformation. But hitherto they had constituted a sort of spiritual demimonde where few men dared or cared to venture. To what magic must we attribute the astonishing expansion of the sects and the concomitant crumbling of Puritanism?

Fundamentally, Puritanism carried the seed of its disintegration within itself. The Puritan message was in some respects a doctrine of individualism. The emphasis on election--the sense of being called by God to reign with Christ--was calculated to raise in the man of humblest parts and social situation an unquenchable confidence of one's self and one's authority. This tendency was given a strong impetus by the Puritan doctrines regarding the Bible. The central position of the Bible as the ultimate authority in all matters of faith and the teaching that its contents were obvious and self-explanatory plus the long delay in setting up a new Establishment tended to produce arrogant theologians among yeomen, mechanicks, and apprentices. To wise John

---

[115] Edwards, Reasons against the Independent Government, "The Epistle Dedicatory," unpaged.

[116] Ibid.

Selden, as to many others, this principle was the primary cause of England's miseries: "Scrutamini scripturas. These two words have undone the world."[117] He saw that the variety of religious opinion which this teaching produced could never be reconciled because there was no commonly acknowledged authority by which the oracle of the Bible could be interpreted.

> The Puritan would be judged by the word of God: if he would speak clearly, he means himself, but that he is ashamed to say so; and he would have me believe him before a whole church, that have read the word of God as well as he. One says one thing, and another another; and there is, I say, no measure to end the controversy.[118]

The result was that there sprang up all over England little groups of earnest and dogmatic believers, each proclaiming with pathetic ludicrousness that it was the remnant in the way of truth.

Prior to 1640 these tendencies within Puritanism were held to a minimum. The universal deference paid to the principle of uniformity, the royal authority, the elaborate machinery of ecclesiastical discipline of the Anglican church--all these acted as a bulwark against the flood of religious eccentricity and individualism. After that date, however, the vast engine of repression which Laud had so carefully built completely broke down. The resulting anarchy allowed to all men uninhibited exploration of religious experience and to all opinions free growth. In addition, the very repression which Anglicanism had employed to stifle the Puritan tendencies toward multiple sectarianism had only served to intensify it. As Edwards described it, "One extremitie . . . . hath caused another, the Tyrannie of Episcopall government in some Bishops hath brought forth the Democracie and Independencie, the violent pressing of some pretended orders hath set many against all order."[119] All these factors, magnified a hundredfold by the tense political excitement leading up to the actual war situation, united to produce the amazing aggrandizement of the sects at the expense of more orthodox Puritanism.

---

[117] John Selden, Table Talk, ed. Samuel Harvey Reynolds (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892), p. 10.

[118] Ibid., p. 164.

Unlike most cases of similar nature, contemporaries were acutely conscious of the development that was taking place before their eyes. Immediately upon their return from abroad in 1640, the Dissenting Brethren noted the unstable character of the newer Puritanism, and its tendencies toward divisive and separatistic forms. "We found," they observed, "the spirits of the people of this Kingdome that professe or pretend to the power of godlinesse (they finding themselves to be so much at liberty, and new come out of bondage) ready to take any impressions, and to be cast into any mould that hath but the appearance of a stricter way."[120] Out of the stuff of this mentality, the sects rapidly doubled and tripled in size. Edwards correctly dated the expansion from 1640, and told the Long Parliament, "The sects have been growing upon us ever since the first year of Your sitting and have every year increased more and more."[121] By 1641 all the characteristic marks of the Commonwealth era of sectarianism had appeared, for Bishop Hall rose in the house of lords and lamented that London should contain "no fewer than fourscore congregations of several sectaries . . . . instructed by guides fit for them, Cobblers, Tailors, Feltmakers, and such like trash: which all are taught to spit in the face of their Mother, the Church of England; and to defy and revile her government."[122] And by the middle of 1644, this "Deformation," as Edwards terms it,[123] had reached such proportions that Baillie could despairingly write that "the most of the people who are counted religious, are running to wayes of errour and schisme of many diverse kinds."[124]

---

[119] Edwards, Reasons against the Independent Government, "The Epistle Dedicatory," unpaged.

[120] Apologeticall Narration, p. 24.

[121] Thomas Edwards, Gangraena, or a Catelogue and Discovery of Many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and Pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of This Time, Vented and Acted in England These Last Four Years (London: R. Smith, 1646), "The Epistle," unpaged.

A religious movement of such magnitude could not fail to touch the Puritan party, albeit only indirectly. To be sure, few of the respectable and orthodox Puritan divines could be induced to venture beyond Presbyterianism or Independency. The sectarian movement was too much characterized by democracy, theological crudities, and the usurpation of ministerial functions by "Handy-crafts-Men, Boys, and Women" to prove attractive to the clerical temper.[125] Even here, however, there were a few eminent men who were influenced by the same forces which gave birth to the sects. Peter Sterry, George Cockayne, Tobias Crisp, William Dell, and John Saltmarsh were no tub-preachers but learned university divines, despite their thorough-going mysticism; while John Goodwin went down a parallel road that ended just short of rationalism. Even such a light of New England as Thomas Shepard felt the call in his youth: "I heard of Grindleton & I did question whether that glorious estate of pfection might not be the truth, & whether old m^{r} Rogers 7 Treatises & the Practise of X^{tianity} the book which did first woorke vpon my hart whether these men were not all Legall men & there bookes so."[126] What is even more surprising is that according to the Scots, heterodoxy tainted some of the party leaders. In 1643 Baillie remarked that Nye "ran out, above all our understandings" when he preached on the spiritual life "upon a knowledge of God as God, without the scripture, without grace, without Christ,"[127] and Edwards also noted that the Independents had "Apes and Peacocks, conceits and toyes, as strange coined distinctions, new strained expositions of Scriptures, odd opinions about the personall raigne of Christ on earth."[128] These "Apes and Peacocks," moreover, cannot have been peculiar to the Brethren, for Baillie a few years later reported that "the most of the chiefe divines here, not only Independents, bot others, such as Twiss, Marshall, Palmer, and many more, are express Chiliasts."[129] Yet on the whole, the Assembly remained free of any real religious radicalism, and the only member who was really suspect was Peter Sterry. Outside that body, however, the threat was more serious, and genuine sectarian influences won a foothold even in the Presbyterian citadel of London. After reporting in 1644 that the Puritan organization in London had its weekly meetings, Baillie went on to say, "They are all Presbyterian, except Burton said to be a Brownist, John Goodwin to be a Socinian, and one scrupling Paedobaptisme."[130] Yet for the most part the impact of Puritan disintegration was to make itself felt on the party in other ways.

---

[122] The Works of Joseph Hall, D.D., Successively Bishop of Exeter and Norwich, VIII (Oxford: D. A. Talboys, 1837), 489-490.

[123] Edwards Gangraena, "The Epistle."

[124] Baillie, II, 195.

[125] Heylyn, Part II, Book V, p. 56.

Of far greater importance was the connection between the sects and the Independents, and the effect which this intimacy had on Presbyterian-Congregational relations. The growing connection of Independency with the sects was a gradual development. At first, the adherents of the "new way" seem to have shared the disgust so universally exhibited toward the sects. This was certainly the case in New England, and even as late as 1643 the Dissenting Brethren could write that they had "the fatall miscarriages and shipwracks of the Separation . . . . as Landmarks to fore-warn us of those rocks and shelves they ran upon."[131] But as time went on, this attitude changed. Independency itself was subject to a disintegration movement, or rather the disintegration of Puritanism took place through the medium of Independency. Thus, about the end of 1643 Baillie wrote that "the Independent partie growes; but the Anabaptists more; and the Antinomians most,"[132] and a few months later that "far most part" of the Independents had "fallen off to Anabaptisme and Antinomianisme." "Sundry also," he went on, "to worse, if worse needs be: the mortalitie of the soule, the denyall of angels and devills, and cast off all sacraments, and many blasphemous things."[133] These sects seem to have had their birth in Independency and to have retained a sense of identification with the older movement, partly because of political reasons, but also because there was a real family connection. Many a Puritan who began as an orthodox Protestant in 1640 made a sort of spiritual pilgrimage through Independency to the Baptist, Quaker, Fifth Monarchy, and other communions. The growth of these bodies out of Independency in turn altered the parent communion so that the Independency of Cromwell, Vane, and John Goodwin was a far different movement from that of Davenport and Cotton. Lastly, close connections between Independency and the sects was necessitated by the political consideration that only a tight alliance of all minority groups could hope to withstand the overwhelming power and prestige of Presbyterianism. The Dissenting Brethren were desperately in need of a large popular following in England, and the sects were equally in need of a respectable banner under which they could gather. The satisfaction of both these needs was found in the common support of the principle of toleration. To discerning men, these factors seemed to have an alliance for the common goal as their necessary and logical conclusion. As early as 1641 Edwards prophesied what was to come about two years later:

---

[126] "The Autobiography of Thomas Shepard," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts: Transactions, XXVII (1927-30), 362-363.

[127] Baillie, II, 97. [128] Edwards, Antapologia, pp. 261-262.

[129] Baillie, II, 313. [130] Ibid., p. 192.

---

[131] Apologeticall Narration, pp. 4-5.

[132] Baillie, II, 117.

[133] Ibid., p. 168.

> Independancie will bring againe what now it would cast out, namely libertinisme, prophanenesse, errors, and will by some removes bring many men to be of no religion at all . . . . . The greatest sort of erroneous spirits . . . . will be much for Independant Government and Tolerations, and be to their uttermost against Synods & setled Government: Socinians, Arminians, Anabaptists, Separatists, how different soever in other principles, yet will agree in this; Independancie will both breed them, and being bred will foster them.[134]

The fruit of this community of interest was the gradual acceptance of the doctrine of toleration by the Independents. Demanding from the first a toleration for their own gathered congregations, the Dissenting Brethren came to see that a limited toleration was inapplicable and that only by broadening the principle to include all sectaries could their demands carry any weight. This necessity of toleration, moreover, was made more urgent by the military situation, for this principle was the only force which could hold together the diverse elements in the struggle against the king. Yet the acceptance of the principle, however necessary, seems to have been a bitter pill, and Sir Nathaniel Barnardiston wrote unhappily to New England that "noe opineones

---

[134] Edwards, Reasons against Independent Government, "The Epistle Dedicatory," unpaged.

& blasfemy is so bad, but that our Independentes heer generally will shelter & countenance, for all heresyes & sectes wilbe Independantes vnder this notion, that none should be trobled for ther contience though hurtfull to others."[135] Other Independent leaders, however, moving rapidly to the left, embraced and even expanded the idea so that John Goodwin was accused of declaring that "by God's command, the magistrate is discharged to put the least discourtesie on any man, Turk, Jew, Papist, Socinian, or whatever, for his religion."[136]

With the Independents' gradual acceptance of the obligation of championing a general toleration, the relations between Independents and Presbyterians became ever more estranged. Both the Presbyterians and the sects were determined that the other should not triumph. The sects resented the proprietary attitude of the Presbyterians toward the revolution and insisted that they were entitled to some of the fruits of the new religious situation. The law of uniformity, complained a cell of London sectaries, "was not a true law, for it was made by the Bishops, and they would not obey it."[137] The Presbyterians, on the other hand, deriving much of their strength from their role as the guardians of order, could not permit the sectaries full freedom. The reaction against ecclesiastical disorder was strong in England, and after the fall of the old church, most of it centered on the Presbyterian system. Thomas Wiseman felt that he could never know peace "till the government of the Church which is so distracted be again settled, and all these Separatists and Sectaries be brought to a good conformity."[138] Much the same feeling was expressed by Dering in 1641 when he urged "a well chosen and well temper'd Nationall Synod, and Gods Blessing thereon: this may cure us: without this (in my poor opinion) England is like to turn it selfe into a great Amsterdam."[139] To these factors making for Presbyterian bigotry was added the insistence of the Scots who had early announced their intention of "suppressing the Names of Heresies, and Sects, Puritans, Conformists, Separatists, Anabaptists, &c., which do rent asunder the Bowels both of Kirk and Kingdom."[140]

---

[135] Miller, p. 273, quoting Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections, Series 4, VI, 550.

[136] Baillie, II, 184.

[137] Cal.S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVII (1640-41), p. 418.

In the bitter struggle which these feelings produced, the Independents chose to take the part of the sects. Back in 1641 the Company of Ministers had tried to commit the Dissenting Brethren to the war on the sects, and one of the provisions of the Engagement was that "both they and we should joyne together to preach against the Anabaptists and rigid Brownists, which these Apologists promised, only they desired first to bring in a Narrative to us of all their opinions that they held in difference."[141] Despite this promise and the continual urgings of the Company, the Brethren never brought in the narration, and consequently this abortive alliance against the sects was never completed. After the opening of the Westminster Assembly when the struggle entered its acute phase, this fraternity between the Congregationalists and the sects was exchanged for an active alliance. For a time, Baillie had hoped "to have our Presbytries erected . . . . and gett the chieffe of the Independents to joyn with us in our practicall conclusions," and thus to "winn about all the rest of these wild and enormous people,"[142] but this did not in fact occur. The Independents held out for a toleration against the Presbyterian offer of a "reasonable accommodation," but as Baillie said, "for that toleration they aime at we cannot consent."[143] The result was that the Dissenting Brethren in the Assembly took up the cause of the sects and constantly championed, sometimes with some embarrassment, the right of toleration. With this development, all hope of unity between Presbyterians and Independents was abandoned, and the resulting stalemate allowed time and liberty for the "horrid blasphemies" of the sects to grow and propagate themselves.

---

[138] Ibid., Vol. XVIII (1641-43), p. 25.

[139] Dering, pp. 104-105.

[140] Rushworth, V, 388.

[141] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 241.

Yet the truly great influence of the sectarian movement on the Puritan party was felt in neither the Puritan leadership nor the Westminster Assembly. Rather it was felt in the amazingly rapid and widespread defection of great masses of the Puritan laity from orthodox Puritanism. Few of the clergy were affected and none of the great leaders, so that visibly the party was not hurt at all. But if one plumbed deeper, it was easy to see that great sections of the influential laity had deserted orthodox Puritanism so that the party retained its leadership intact but was sadly depleted in following. If this situation did not find reflection in the party organization, it found reflection in the success with which the party pursued its goals. The Presbyterian party--as the rump of the old Puritan party--soon found itself raped of its once great prestige and opposed by a mighty army of sectaries. In the civil and religious anarchy which followed, it was apparent that Puritanism had split into a multiplicity of warring factions, none of which could ever become the great Puritan church. As a matter of fact, the century-old hope for a great

---

[142] Baillie, II, 172. [143] *Ibid.*, p. 140.

Puritan Establishment in England was once more frustrated--this time permanently. In 1640 when the invading Scots promised in their manifesto that "the names of Sects and Separatists shall no more be mentioned," Laud had written in the margin of his copy, "Because all will be such."[144] The martyred archbishop was a greater prophet than he knew.

---

[144] Notes of the Treaty Carried on at Ripon between King Charles I and the Covenanters of Scotland, A.D. 1640, Taken by Sir John Borough, Garter King of Arms, ed. John Bruce ("Camden Society Publications," C [Westminster, 1859]), 77.

CHAPTER IX

EPILOGUE:
THE EMERGENCE OF LAY OPPOSITION

With the development of the anarchical religious situation in England and the rapid fragmentation of Puritanism, the Puritan party literally fell apart. Presbyterians, Independents, and even the sects might continue to agitate vainly for their own particular brand of reformation, but Puritanism as a political power was largely a thing of the past. Yet there was another aspect to the disintegration of the Puritan party which has been alluded to from time to time in the preceding pages. The emergence of the lay spirit in England and its relation to religious problems is a subject which would require another dissertation, but in a brief concluding essay we may hope to sketch its effect on the Puritan party and on the Puritan aspirations for reformation.

I

The rise of the lay spirit was not a new or recent development in England. A vigorous and popular anticlericalism had flourished throughout the later part of the Middle Ages. Only rarely, however, had this sentiment threatened the dominant position of the clergy; the one great exception, of course, is the Wyclifite movement. But it was with the advent of the Renaissance that the lay spirit truly emerged in full strength and respectability. This-worldly in outlook and critical of clerical authority, the movement tended to produce in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England a frank acknowledgment of the primacy of mundane claims and an impatience with churchly traditions of clerical dominance. This sentiment had demonstrated its increasing vigor on several occasions under the first Tudors[1]--notably in the Richard Hunne case--and broke into full flower in the second half of the century. Throughout the Elizabethan Age it found embodiment in most of the principal figures of the period, though to be sure the Reformation proved a source of a growing contradictory tradition. Bacon, Sidney, Jonson, Marlowe, and lastly the great Shakespeare himself were all children of the Renaissance, and though they felt no animus toward the church, their works betray little concern with religion. Perhaps the greatest representative of the new spirit was the presiding genius of the age, Elizabeth herself, who was as devoutly secular as her sister had been fanatically religious.

The Renaissance spirit together with the ever increasing importance of the laity did not at once manifest an anticlerical bias. The men of the new age could afford to be indifferent toward the clergy so long as they were steadily being relegated to a subordinate position in the national life. The Tudor policy of maintaining an alliance of crown and parliament at the expense of the church performed precisely this function. With the advent of the Stuart dynasty, however, all this was changed. Experiencing increasing difficulties in maintaining harmonious relations with his parliaments, James I gradually revolutionized the basis of royal power by entering into an alliance with the church against the parliament. Brought to its full development by his son, this policy brought the church to an eminence which it had not enjoyed since the days of Wolsey, Gardiner, and Pole. As in former times, great ecclesiastical statesmen such as Williams, Laud, and Juxon emerged, while a host of lesser clergy became local magistrates as justices of the peace. The natural result of this development was that the lay spirit took on a strong Erastian tinge. This reaction manifested itself very generally throughout the nation, and seems to have pervaded all classes and parties in the great struggles of the age. The rise of a strong anticlericalism within the Puritan constituency is obscured by the common hatred of the hierarchy for its Arminianism. But in the Episcopal Erastians we get a clear picture of the lay mind in protest against revived clerical pretensions, a protest all the more significant since it was made in spite of the loyalty of the Episcopal Erastians to the old church.

---

[1] See H. Maynard Smith, Pre-Reformation England (London: MacMillan and co., ltd., 1938).

At the very moment--during the debates in the commons in 1640 and 1641--when the Episcopal members were attempting to save the historic Establishment, they made it clear that they bore no love for the Laudian hierarchy. "My Lord Digbie, the Viscount of Falkland, Sir Benjamin Ridiers [Rudyerd]," wrote Baillie on one occasion, ". . . . did declaime most acutelie, as we could have wished, against the corruptions of Bishops; bot their conclusion was, the keeping in of a limited Episcopacie."[2] The explanation of this conduct does not seem to be uniform with all the Episcopal Erastians. On some men the old church seems to have had a genuine hold, and in these cases Anglicanism and Erastianism were fused in a manner reminiscent of the best Elizabethan traditions. Such, for example, was Hyde, who though a vigorous champion of the discredited church willingly assented to the proposals to curb the ecclesiastical courts.[3] But many of the Episcopal Erastians seem to have been Episcopal only because they were so thoroughly Erastian. Gifted with uncommon insight into the theocratic tendendencies of clerical Puritanism, these men were deeply convinced that an Episcopal Establishment was much more suited to Erastian control than a Presbyterian one. Digby sounded the alarm in the commons, though at the moment his words were in vain. "If we hearken to those who would quite extirpate Episcopacy," he cried, "I am confident that instead of every bishop we should put down in a diocese, we should erect a pope in each parish."[4] The point, though unpopular, was a telling one, and Digby's words soon found an echo in the warnings of the gentry of conservative counties. Early in 1641, a petition to the lords disclosed the uneasiness of the Cheshire gentlemen:

---

[2] Baillie, I, 307. [3] Shaw, I, 91.

> We cannot but express our just fears that their desire is to introduce an absolute innovation of Presbyterial government, whereby we who are now governed by the Canon and civil laws dispensed by twenty-six ordinaries, easily responsible to Parliament for any deviation from the rule of law, conceive we should become exposed to the mere arbitrary government of a numerous Presbytery, who, together with their ruling elders, will arise to near forty thousand Church governors.[5]

In 1641 the parliament was not in a position to listen to such complaints, but it cannot be doubted that the petitioners struck a responsive cord.

The supreme example of this aspect of Episcopal Erastianism is John Selden. Selden's loyalty to episcopacy was largely determined by his devotion to Erastianism, and after the fall of the old church he cheerfully took part in the Westminster Assembly. The Erastian basis of his championship of the bishops he frankly acknowledged. "They that would pull down the bishops," he noted,

> and erect a new way of government, do as he that pulls down an old house, and builds another of another fashion. There's a great deal ado, and a great deal of trouble

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[5] Gardiner, IX, 285, n. 1.

. . . .; and perhaps the old one would have served as well.[6] This feeling, moreover, was furthered by a well-grounded fear of Presbyterianism. "Presbyters have the greatest power of any clergy in the world, and gull the laity most" was his dictum.[7] But despite the tremendous changes in the English religious situation in the years following 1640, Selden preached his creed with unswerving loyalty. One of his most characteristic utterances was elicited by the question whether the church or the scripture was the judge of religion.

> Answer: In truth neither, but the state. I am troubled with a boil; I call a company of surgeons about me; one prescribes one thing, another another; I single out something I like, and ask you that stand by, and are no surgeon, what you think of it: you like it too; you and I are the judges of the plaister, and we bid them prepare it, and there's an end. Thus 'tis in religion.[8]

Perhaps it was out of the experience of the religious strife that was convulsing the nation that the learned and scholarly Erastian uttered his wrathful cry, "Chain up the clergy on both sides."[9]

Selden cannot be said to be the typical Erastian, for he possessed highly individualistic personality, but he did represent at a conscious level what a great mass of the English laity manifested in their attitudes. Like Selden, they entertained no doubts or questionings as to the truth of religion. They were usually attached to the ceremonies of the church with genuine feeling. Sometimes they might have real friendships with local clergymen, perhaps even with great churchmen; one thinks of the intimacy of Selden and Ussher. But they were not disposed to stand for any nonsense about divine right or to tolerate the interference of the clergy in the more mundane departments of the national life. As to just how far this attitude was characteristic of

---

[6] Selden, p. 26.
[7] Ibid., p. 156.
[8] Ibid., p. 162.
[9] Ibid., p. 45.

Englishmen in 1640 is difficult to say, but the indications are that it was fairly widespread among the parliamentary classes--the merchants, the gentry, and especially the lawyers.

The rise of the lay spirit in the Puritan communion constitutes a special case, and one in which we are primarily concerned. In many ways the lay spirit in Puritanism was indistinguishable from the sentiment in the nation as a whole. After all, the Puritan was immersed in seventeenth-century English civilization and tended to share the views of his fellows in most important concerns. Yet the rise of the lay spirit within Puritanism presents a real problem, for there the new outlook was combined with an intense and burning religiosity. How did laymen and a strong lay consciousness come to dominate a movement which Selden still regarded as most dangerous to the rights of the laity?

In its origin, Puritanism was largely a clerical movement. For the most part, its beginnings can be traced to those radical English Protestant divines who during the years of Mary Tudor's reign lived out their exile in the citadels of the Continental Reformation. Then when the glad tidings of the accession of the young Elizabeth reached them, they hastened home bearing with them, not the Protestantism of Edward VI, but that of Geneva, Strassburg, and Frankfort. In the Continental centers of Reformed Protestantism and later in Scotland, it was the clergy that assumed and retained the leadership of the new movement, and there is little reason to suppose that the case would have been different in England. But Elizabeth successfully frustrated the designs of the radical reformers, retained control in her own hands, and guided the English church into an ambiguous but essentially conservative settlement. Thus, the rebuffed reformers were obliged to direct their attention to converting the nation to win the Establishment, rather than the preferred sequence of converting the Establishment to win the nation.

The necessity of attempting the slow, labored process of converting the mass of English laity to the Puritan program undoubtedly dealt a cruel blow to ministerial prestige. Rather than being in a position to impose a clerical theocracy on the people, the English Puritan clergy were forced to rely more and more on the prestige and numbers of the Puritan laity for whatever advances the movement made. Even so, the movement at the time of Thomas Cartwright was still to a high degree clerical and even academic.[10] But the great change was slowly taking place. Even in the time of Cartwright a great lay leader like Peter Wentworth could attract the eye of the Puritan community, and with time the number of such figures grew greater.

The spread of lay influence within Puritanism was determined to a very considerable extent by the fact that Puritanism found its strongest support in the members of the middle class. Puritanism cannot be said to have become a mere function of the rising bourgeoisie as some have tried to make it, but it is true that the new religious movement and the new class were tightly bound together. Such a union could not but greatly intensify the lay spirit within Puritanism, for, as children of the new age, the middle classes were inclined to push forward eagerly, throwing aside any vestiges of clerical tutorship. Moreover, it was a union in which various secular concerns of the middle class became associated with Puritanism simply because both existed side by side in the attitudes of the same men. To some extent, this union was a coalition or alliance in which the two interests joined to make a powerful front against Stuart "absolutism" and

---

[10] Usher, Presbyterian Movement, p. xxiv.

Arminianism. In a passage quoted elsewhere, for instance, Baxter noted the entente which apparently existed between the Puritans and the "Good Commonwealth Men" in the Long Parliament.[11] We have already noted, however, that in many ways the two interests could not be separated or made mutually exclusive. When confronted with the Book of Sports or with forced loans the Puritan gentleman did not stop to distinguish the motives which drove him into sharp opposition to the measures. The elder Vane, wrote one Puritan parliament man, "hath as true an hart to God and the kingdom's good as any,"[12] and this identification of the two causes tended to become one of the fundamental assumptions of large segments of the English gentry and merchant class. Even among the clergy the coalition of Puritanism and the constitutional and economic grievances tended to fuse into a real unity. Nowhere is this more adequately expressed than in the passage where the later Congregational divine, Henry Burton, explains the motives which led him to oppose the efforts of the high churchmen to overthrow Protestantism and the liberties of the subject.

> Both as I was a poore servant of Christ, and therefore bound to vindicate his cause against Antichristian men: and also as a free borne subject of the kingdome, as one who ever prized the just libertie of my birthright above this life it selfe: I therefore thought how I might best acquit my duty both to God, and to his Church, and to my Country, in defending the cause of both.[13]

The result of this close union was to make one cause out of all the various elements of the popular opposition, regardless of the sources from which they sprang. To be sure, men were still capable of distinguishing between the types of grievances that formed the opposition to Stuart rule, but it was often impossible to separate them--the derisive term "political Puritan" is a witness to both the disjunction and intimacy of the religious and secular interests. The inclusion of Puritanism with all the other grievances to form one united opposition was so momentous a development that it tended to eclipse the old clerical leadership of the movement at the same time that it exalted the importance of the laity. By the very fact that all the elements of the opposition coalesced into a unity, it was very natural that the leaders of the one cause should also become leaders of the other. Thus a Pym, a Hampden, or a Cromwell tended to embody in their persons the direction not only of the constitutional, social, and economic opposition but that of the religious as well. Occasionally a clergyman could aspire to the leadership of the whole complex of forces arrayed against Charles as when Burton won fame and glory by defying the government in the name of God, church, and country. But for the most part, the clergy suffered too greatly from the inhibitions imposed by their profession to take over successfully the direction of the whole opposition. Moreover, it was the laity that "had the floor." The Puritan parliament members were at the center of the conflict, possessed a high consciousness of their representing the nation, and could draw on the traditions and prestige of parliament to champion the Puritan cause. All this constituted a tremendous advantage which the isolated ministers, denied even the humble sounding-board of the convocation, could scarcely hope to equal.

---

[11] See above, chap. vii.

[12] Proceedings in Kent, p. 4. [13] Burton, p. 9.

The rise of the laity to a dominating position within Puritanism did not come about all at once nor were the clergy ever entirely dispossessed of the tremendous power which they wielded on the policies of the movement. But slowly, almost imperceptibly, the great Puritan laymen began to take an ever larger part in the direction of party affairs. Even in the time when the great Preston was the undisputed chief of the party, he could not maintain his policies in the face of the opposition of the Puritan peers.[14] And a few years later when the colonizing expedition to Massachusetts was formed, the leadership was largely though not entirely in the hands of the Puritan laity.[15] Perhaps the most significant indication of the full importance of the laity in the movement was the composition of the board of feoffees of impropriations. The four lawyers and four citizens of London together made eight laymen to the four ministers on the board.[16]

In itself, this development did not constitute any threat of disunity. Indeed, in spite of its momentous significance, there was little consciousness among the actors involved that a great change was taking place. Rather than feeling any envy or antagonism toward one another, the clergy and laity worked in closest harmony for the advancement of the Puritan Reformation. Nevertheless, the materials for a schism were at hand, and if the Puritan community did not at once recognize the cleavage that ran through its ranks, the time was coming when it could not afford the luxury of such blindness. For the moment, the common enemy held them together, but when Laud and Wentworth were destroyed and the "liberties of the subject" guaranteed, the division of interests between clergy and laity might well bring on a clash.

II

As the year 1640 approached, the instability in the Puritan party caused by the potential tension between clergy and laity and by the intimate connection with non-religious causes was des-

---

[14] See above, chap. iv. [15] See above, chap. v.

[16] See above, chap. v.

tined to become greater through two new developments. In its interaction with Puritanism, the lay spirit could not take a secular form, but it did develop a Puritan lay consciousness that often found its way to Erastianism and anticlericalism. The two developments were closely allied, and their triumph does much to explain the nation's resistance to the Puritan Reformation. Prior to 1640, neither tendency was ever clearly manifested, since there was no opportunity for friction between Puritan clergy and laity to appear. It would have been a strange thing if Puritan ministers and laymen, while suffering under a repressive government, had brooded on their differences. Yet all the while, great segments of the Puritan community were becoming increasingly receptive to Erastianism. This attitude, so damning to nearly a century of clerical Puritan aspirations, had by 1642 become so pronounced that a conflict with the clergy was inevitable. Though not based on theological principles, this coming schism was really to be an additional chapter in the history of the disintegration of the Puritan party.

The basis for the development of Erastianism was that there was a real divergence of aims and attitudes between the clergy and laity. To some extent, this was unavoidable. After all, there was an actual division between the two groups. The clergy especially had an exalted sense of their calling as prophets of God and a consciousness of the ideal of professional unity. In response to this, and later in opposition, the laity thought of themselves as laity. It was only natural that these two group loyalties should tend to erect certain barriers, as when Selden observed that the laity were in the habit of thinking humility was a good doctrine for the clergy while the clergy thought it good for the laity.[17] But in addition to these rival class feelings, a serious divergence of aim had early appeared in the movement. As early as 1589 Richard Bancroft, the future primate, had preached a sermon at Paul's Cross in which he neatly distinguished between the lay and clerical Puritans, and attempted to turn the one against the other. The Puritan clergy, he pointed out, however much they might decry the great state of the bishops, were insistent that the church retain its own, that "all livings which now appertain to the church, ought of right to be imploied for the maintenance of their presbyteries" and even that "the old spoile of the abbies and such religious houses should be restored againe."[18] Furthermore, Bancroft warned, the ministers "shoote at greater superioritie and preeminence, then ever your Bishops did use . . . . and would no doubt tyrannise by their censures over both prince and people at their pleasure, in most untolerable and popelike manner."[19] But the Puritan laity, on the other hand, were of "a far contrarie opinion."

> For saie they . . . . our preachers ought to conforme themselves to the example of Christ and his Apostles. Their Master had not a house to put his head in. The apostles their predecessors had neither gold nor silver . . . . and why then should they being in gifts and paines inferior unto them, have greater preferments in the world then they had? If they have a messe of pottage and a canvas dublet, may it not content them?[20]

This emphasis must have been highly prevalent among the Puritan laity, for Bancroft concluded that "the hope which manie men have conceived of the spoile of Bishops livings, of the subversion of cathedrall churches, and a havocke to be made of al the churches revenues, is the cheefest and most principall cause of the greatest schismes that we have at this day in our church."[21]

---

[17] Selden, p. 78.

[18] Richard Bancroft, A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the 9 of Februarie, Being the First Sunday in the Parleament, Anno. 1588 (London: Gregorie Seton, 1588), p. 24.

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 93-94. [20] *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

Bancroft's purpose led him to exaggerate his account somewhat, and he did scant justice to the economic disinterestedness of many of the Puritan laymen. Yet he had with uncommon astuteness described the sound basis which existed for future discord. The Puritan divines, like their brethren in Scotland and on the Continent, were unyielding in their demand for a strong clerical Establishment where all the powers of the old church would not only be retained but augmented by reason of the greater popularity and efficiency of the Puritan ecclesiastical system. For many Puritan laymen, however, such an ideal held little attraction. The new middle classes were in the act of winning the dominant position over the political and economic life of the nation, and they had no desire to submit themselves and their hard-won gains to the control of a host of presbyters. Moreover, the Puritan laymen had become accustomed in the years of "persecution" to leading the fight against the high churchmen, and it was natural that they should hesitate to resign their command at the moment when victory was assured. In this resolve, they were strengthened by the vigorous Erastian tradition in parliament. In was parliament that had carried through all the religious changes of the first Reformation and that had maintained true religion against the Arminianism of the crown and convocation, and there was no reason why a Puritan parliament should not continue these precedents.

On the basis of these tensions and conflicts, then, a Puritan Erastianism began to take shape. It did not everywhere and in every person assume the same characteristics. In most men, it was vague and nebulous, an attitude more than a doctrine. But everywhere that Erastianism appeared, it was characterized by a strong distrust of clerical ambitions, and a determination to erect safeguards against priestly dominance. This feeling was immeasurably strengthened by the experience of the Puritan movement in the quarter-century preceding the outbreak of the Puritan Revolution.

---

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

It is ironical that to some extent the seed of Erastianism and anticlericalism within the Puritan community was sown by the Puritan ministers themselves. Faced with a resurgent Anglicanism, the Puritan divines attempted to rally their followers by preaching fervent crusades against the "papist" clergy and hierarchy that Laud was introducing into the church. Schooled to regard the Anglo-Catholics as monsters of iniquity and urged to dispute their theological interpretations, the laity naturally began to lose their respect for the cloth, while the appeals for reformation in the fast day sermons before the commons were often flatteringly Erastian.

For the most part, however, the laity did not require the exhortations of Puritan divines to teach them ill will toward the clergy. All the distrust and unfriendliness which the laity tended to harbor toward the clergy seems to have hardened into determined opposition during the years following the accession of Charles in 1625. For one thing, Englishmen had to suffer the advancement of clerics to positions of high political importance. Clarendon, speaking of the appointment of Bishop Juxon as Lord Treasurer, tells us of the jealousy which this policy excited. "This . . . . most unjustly indisposed many towards the church itself; which they looked upon as the gulph ready to swallow all the great offices, there being other churchmen in view, of that robe, who were ambitious enough to expect the rest."[22] May, the historian of the Long Parliament, also recorded the extreme bitterness which the political activities of the churchmen aroused:

> Archbishop Laud, who was now grown into great favour with the king, made use of it especially to advance the pomp and temporal honour of the clergy . . . . insomuch as the people merrily, when they saw that treasurer, with the other bishops, riding to Westminster, called it the church triumphant; doctors and parsons of parishes were made every where justices of peace, to the great grievance of the country in civil affairs, and depriving them of their spiritual edification.[23]

But this hostility was not the simple resentment caused by competition in place-hunting. A much deeper issue was involved--the issue of whether the crown or the parliamentary forces were to control the church. The crown, having acknowledged the impossibility of dominating the parliament, was attempting to realize its ambitions by means of an alliance with the church. Even as late as 1646 Charles was lecturing the young prince on the "infallible maxim, that as the Church can never flourish without the Crown, so the dependency of the Church on the Crown is the chief support of regal authority."[24] In the hectic years of personal rule, this royal policy was given a full trial. Laud and his friends were given important positions in London, and were accepted by the king as confidential advisers. The propaganda potentialities of the pulpit were organized and the hierarchy's control over it extended.[25] And lastly, local clergy were being utilized by the central government to usurp the position of the gentry in their own country strongholds through the appointment of clerical justices of the peace. Although the attempt ultimately failed, it was for a while very close to success, and it is not surprising that the classes affected emerged from the nightmare of the personal rule determined to retain a strong grip on the church.

---

[22] Clarendon, I, 175.

[23] Thomas May, The History of the Parliament of England Which Began November 3, 1640 (Oxford: University Press, 1854), pp. 23-24.

[24] Calendar of Clarendon State Papers, I, 212.

[25] See the article by Davies, The Huntington Library Quarterly, III (1939-40), 1-22.

As soon as the parliamentary leaders had the opportunity they gave vigorous expression to this resolution. After the dissolution of the Short Parliament in the spring of 1640, the clergy had asserted their independence of parliament by continuing--contrary to custom--to meet in convocation. As might be expected, a great outcry was made at this precedent--an outcry in which the Puritan clergy with questionable foresight joined. As soon as the Long Parliament met a few months later, the late canons were attacked with a hatred which, according to a correspondent of Hyde's, excelled that reserved for ship-money.[26] For the occasion, Sir Edward Dering undertook a long speech in which he concluded that "no Canons can bind the Laity, where we have no Voice of our own."[27] "To conclude us up now," he declared, "and shut us out . . . . not to admit us to Determination, nay to exclude us from Consultation, and after all to take from us all Assent . . . . and yet to bind us by Decrees; so we may prove (I fear) no less than Soul-Tyranny."[28] Even more significant was the strong Erastian color to the speech of the great Puritan leader, Fiennes. The clergy by their canons, he charged, had presumed to assume "a Parliamentary Power, in determining an Heresy not determined by Law, which is expressly reserved to the Determination in Parliament."[29] The result of all this agitation was a solemn declaration by the commons, Nemine contradicente, to the effect that "the

---

[26] Calendar of Clarendon State Papers, I, 212.

[27] Rushworth, IV, 104. [28] Ibid., p. 103.

[29] Ibid., p. 107.

Clergy of England convened in a Convocation or Synod, or otherwise, have no Power to make any Constitutions, Canons, or Acts whatsoever in Matter of Doctrine, Discipline, or otherwise, to bind the Clergy, or the Laity of the Land, without common Consent in Parliament."[30] At the time, of course, this was regarded as a Puritan victory, but it was indicative of the conflict which was to come when the house transferred the principle from Anglican to Puritan divines.

Such manifestations--and they became legion after 1643--showed that Puritanism could harbor within itself a living Erastianism. It was rarely a secular Erastianism, and was often combined with genuine religious devotion, but it was Erastianism nonetheless. But along side of this growing Puritan Erastianism was another branch of the lay spirit, not Erastian in itself, but somewhat complementary to it. This was the assertion by the laity of their growing self-sufficiency in affairs of religion. The development of a self-conscious lay religiousness had been known before 1640, but after that date it expanded rapidly. The feeling was abroad that religiously mature laymen had little need of clerical mentors. "By the faith I bear to God," Peter Wentworth had told Archbishop Parker in 1571, "we will pass nothing before we understand what it is. For that were to make you popes. Make you popes who list, for we will make you none."[31] And by 1640 this feeling had been extended to apply to all clergy regardless of their party. This religious coming of age of the laity did not always manifest an anticlerical coloring, though in the face of the high conception of the ministerial calling entertained by most Puritan divines, that was the tendency. "We look on ministers," Cromwell was to say on a later occasion, "as helpers, not lords over God's people."[32] But if they were anticlericals, there were often theocrats as well. They simply regarded themselves not only as the most capable administrators of the New Jerusalem about to be established, but also as its principal heirs.

---

[30] _Ibid._, p. 112.

[31] Knappen, p. 228, quoting Sir Simonds D'Ewes, _A Compleat Journal of the Votes Speeches and Debates . . . . throughout the Whole Reign of Queen Elizabeth_ (London, 1693), pp. 239-40.

In one Puritan layman of the age, this new spirit was lucidly reflected. Writing in 1641, John Milton had, ironically enough, urged the establishment of Presbyterianism. His conception of Presbyterianism, however, was rather odd, and his chief delight in the system seems to have been the increased importance of the laity which he saw there. For the old clericalism of Anglicanism, Milton had nothing but condemnation:

> For we have learnt that the scornful term of Laic, the consecrating of temples, carpets, and table-cloths, the railing-in of a repugnant and contradictive Mount Sinae in the Gospel (as if the touch of a lay Christian, who is nevertheless God's living temple, could profane dead judaisms), the exclusion of Christ's people from the offices of holy discipline . . . . causes the rest [the laity] to have an unworthy and abject opinion of themselves.[33]

Milton's vision was somewhat clouded in 1641, and he soon found himself deceived in his expectations of Presbyterianism. But by the end of the Commonwealth period he had fully developed his thought on the point. Exhorting all Christians to "know their own dignity" and their equal access "to any ministerial function," he deplored the docility of more conservative laymen.

> While protestants, to avoid the due labour of understanding their own religion, are content to lodge it in the breast, or rather in the books, of a clergyman . . . . they will be always learning and never knowing; always infants; always either vassals, as lay papists are to their priests; or at

---

[32] Rose-Troup, John White, p. 333, n. 2, quoting W. J. Mackenzie, James Maitland, Duke of Maitland, p. 181.

[33] The Prose Works of John Milton (Philadelphia: Herman Hooker, 1845), I, 79-80.

> odds with him, as reformed principles give them some light to be not wholly conformable.[34]

What Milton expressed so clearly, many Puritan laymen had long been practising.

In time, this sentiment began to create characteristic forms of Puritanism. In Independency--"Church Democracy," as Baxter called it--the laity tended to dominate the church. Ministers still occupied an important position, but it was the religiously alert and sophisticated congregation which was the most characteristic feature of the new movement. Because of this, the Independents did not find it necessary to develop a lively anticlericalism against their own ministers; their attitude was essentially that of the declaration of Cromwell's quoted above. Other sects, however, were less restrained, and a popular bitterness toward the "hireling divines," the graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, became quite common, while in the most radical, the tendency manifested its logical culmination in the entire elimination of the clerical order.

This lay religious spirit found its model demonstration, not in England, but in America. Certainly in Massachusetts the Independent Puritan ideal of the right relations between clergy and laity and between church and state was more faithfully represented than anywhere else. In theory, the state and the church were separate but complementary institutions, the magistrates protecting the church and the church caring for the souls of the people. But it is important to note that actually the Puritan Commonwealth was in most respects a theocracy where the religious laymen were in control of both church and state. To conclude that the ministers were ciphers in the Independent state would be highly erroneous, but Massachusetts was no "priest-state" either.[35] In a letter to the Earl of Warwick, Winthrop gave expression to both the great power of the clergy and the limitations of that power. "The Ministers," he declared, "have great power with the poeple, whereby throughe the good correspondency between the magistrates and them, they are the more easyly gouerned being of [illegible] generall sober and religious etc."[36] Puritan magistrates, moreover, could have a high view of their own office as distinct from the church, and Winthrop, when challenged, declared that Christ "hath sett up another kingdome in this worlde, wherein magistrates are his officers, and they are accountable to him, for their miscarriages in the waye and order of this kingdome."[37]

---

[34] _Ibid._, II, 169.

In the England of 1640 both of these attitudes had become current. On the one hand, there was the continuing development within Puritanism toward lay domination of the movement. In part, this was due to the circumstances under which the clergy for nearly three-quarters of a century had been obliged to conduct their campaign for reformation. But it was also due to the tendency within Puritanism toward a self-sufficient lay religiousness. It was from this process that Independency and later the sects derived much of their strength. But combined with this development, there was also a more profane Erastianism based on a simple fear of clerical domination. These were the men, found in great numbers in parliament, who, having tasted freedom from clerical tutelage, had no intention of creating for themselves stricter jailors. Frequently they were Puritan in outlook and in manner of life, but this did not prevent them from acting against the ministry where their interests were involved. Both of these groups were convinced that the old church must be set aside and a Puritan Establishment erected, but they were determined that the new church should not possess any dangerous powers. Presbyterianism might be introduced but it was to be Presbyterianism in a "prudentiall way."[38]

---

[35] See Aaron B. Seidman,"Church and State in the Early Years of the Massachusetts Bay Colony," The New England Quarterly, XVIII (1945), 211-233. The author seems to have a rather superficial understanding of the nature of the Puritan system.

[36] Winthrop Papers, IV, 493.

[37] Ibid., III, 506.

III

For a while the fatal divisions between the Puritan clergy and laity slept unnoticed. The Long Parliament opened amid the closest possible co-operation between the two groups, and this harmony continued for well over a year. As time went on, however, a seed of mutual distrust and suspicion began to enter the hearts of both parties until by the opening of the Westminster Assembly, a disquieting feeling of ill will brooded over the relations of Puritan laymen and divines.

It was natural, of course, that while the full force of Puritan strength was needed for the overthrow of Anglicanism the tension between ministers and laity should be de-emphasized. The clergy were forced by circumstances to pin all their hopes for a Puritan reformation on the zeal of the members of parliament, so naturally they took special pains to be on good terms with the legislators. The matter was not one-sided, however: the parliament also had great need of the services of the divines. The pulpit was the greatest organ of propaganda, and throughout the early forties and especially after the beginning of the Civil War, its resources were repeatedly drawn upon. The commons early recognized the value inherent in the institution of the fast day and soon began decreeing frequent fasts to be observed throughout the whole nation.[39] The services of the ministers were also drawn upon in raising money, and Isaac Pennington, the lord mayor of London, publicly proclaimed that "for the better advancing of this necessary service, the Ministers of everie Parish are requested, publikely to stirre up their Parishioners hereunto."[40] After the opening of the war, the clergy's assistance became all the more essential. Everywhere they acted as propagandists for the parliament, pacifying wavering elements and exhorting others on to greater efforts. On one occasion, wrote an auditor, Stephen Marshall, "that worthy champion of Christ," and Simeon Ashe "subdued and satisfied more malignant spirits amongst us than 1,000 armed men could have done."[41] Even after the beginning of the Westminster Assembly the parliament continued to stand in the need of the ministers' aid, and as late as 1644 we find parliament decreeing that the "Divines of the Assembly that are resiants of the Associated Counties and now attending the Assembly be desired to go down into their several counties to stir up the people to rise for their defense."[42]

---

[38] See the discussion in Benjamin Warfield, The Westminster Assembly and Its Work (New York: Oxford University Press, 1931), p. 40, n. 78.

---

[39] C.J., II, 355.

[40] Discovery of a Great and Wicked Conspiracie, unpaged.

[41] Cal. S.P., Dom., Chas. I, Vol. XVIII (1641-43), p. 388. The tremendous activity of one minister, Marshall, in support of the war is described in The Godly Man's Legacy, p. 13: "Witness Thundrings in all Pulpits; his cursing all people who were backward in their engaging against him [Charles] ; his encouraging all those, whose Villany made them forward in the Undertaking that great Work, warranting them no small Preferment in Heaven, if they would lay down their Lives for the Cause: Witness his Menaces and private Incitations, becoming Drum-major, or Chaplain-General to the Army; praying from Regiment to Regiment at Edge-hill."

Despite this harmony, however, there were also signs that all was not well. The great Puritan leaders in the house of commons were strangely unenthusiastic about any plans for the establishment of a Scottish Presbyterianism. Even the great Pym, if we may believe Bagshaw, intended to retain some form of reformed episcopacy,[43] and so eminent a Puritan as Fiennes assured the house that "by the Law of this Land not only all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, but also all Superiority, and Preheminence over the Ecclesiastical State is annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm, and may be granted by Commission . . . . to such Persons as his Majesty shall think meet."[44] Only once does there seem to have been any uneasiness over this frank Erastianism of the parliament on the part of a member. In May, 1641, Sir Edward Dering called for a national synod, and objected to the theological presumption of the house. "Was it ever heard or seen," he asked, "that a set of Lay-men, Gentlemen, Souldiers, Lawyers, Merchants; all professions admitted, but the profession of professions for this worke, Divines alone excluded, that we should determine upon doctrinal points in Divinity? Theology is not so low, so facile a trade."[45] And even Dering could, when it suited him, wax indignant over the clergy's lobbying activities at Westminster--the "Parliament-pressing Ministers" and the "blacke walkers in Westminster Hall."[46]

One instance which showed the true temper of the house was the ill reception which was given to Burges's speech on the fate of deans and chapters. Parliament was in desperate need of funds, and the wealth of the church seemed to offer the easiest way in which large sums could be raised quickly. The ministers must have known of secular purposes to which the church property was to be diverted, for early in February Baillie wrote that "the deans and prebends and other not-preaching ministers rents, will be taken away; for otherwise the country will never be able to supplie the King's necessitie, and bear their other burdens; bot these superfluous rents will doe all abundantlie."[47] Yet when Burges came to speak for the Puritan clergy in opposition to Hacket, he told the commons that though deans and chapters were useless and should be eliminated, yet it was unlawful to divert any of the endowments to civil uses. "And so," reported D'Ewes, "the divines withdrew, and some spake to that which they had said on both sides, that they were to hold all the Church lands, and we were to have no more."[48] For the moment, the matter was shelved, but it was a signal confirmation of Bancroft's prophecy of a half-century earlier that the Puritan clergy and laity would split on this point.

---

[42] Rose-Troup, John White, pp. 315-316, quoting British Museum Tract, E. 65.

[43] Shaw, I, 39, quoting Bagshaw, Just. Vindicat., British Museum, E. 1019.

[44] Rushworth, IV, 176. [45] Dering, pp. 90-91.

[46] Ibid., p. 2; see above, chap. vi.

Another unmistakable manifestation of the strong Erastian complexion of the commons was given in the course of the debates on the Root and Branch Bill. On June 21, 1641, Vane had proposed the plan, apparently already agreed upon with the ministers, for the administration of the church until a permanent system could be worked out. This plan called for the heretofore episcopal jurisdiction to be administered by a commission composed of equal numbers of ministers and laymen to be appointed by parliament.

---

[47] Baillie, I, 298-299.

[48] Shaw, I, 58, quoting D'Ewes, Diary, II, 556.

This plan was in itself highly Erastian, for the commissioners were to be named by parliament and responsible to it. But on July 12, the house amended the proposal so that ministerial representation was completely eliminated from the proposed commissions and lay commissioners substituted in their places. Circumstances prevented the plan from being carried into execution, but it shows the lines along which the parliament was thinking.[49]

The lessons contained in these actions were not lost on the clergy, and they quickly began to awake from any former optimism concerning the zeal of the parliament. The exhortations in the fast day sermons before the commons began to take on a desperate and rather bitter coloring. In one typical utterance, Marshall warned his hearers that "your pleasures and superfluities, nay your profits & sometimes necessities" must never be permitted to come into conflict with the church of God.[50] But with the Civil War upon them, the ministers and the parliament could not afford to quarrel, and the church settlement was again put off indefinitely.

The war, however, brought one accession of strength to the clergy, and conversely weakened the Erastian forces. At the opening of the war, parliament was badly in need of armed assistance, and naturally sought the aid of Scotland. The Scots were closely allied with the English Presbyterian divines and used their own strong bargaining position to advance the cause of Presbyterianism in the southern kingdom. The younger Vane, the principal member of the English delegation in Scotland, attempted in vain to secure a simple alliance between the two countries. "The English," as Baillie put it, "were for a civill League, we for a religious Covenant."[51] Even when the English gave in on this point, they attempted to salvage something by leaving undefined the type of church to be established in England. Here again the Scots were successful in getting the English to agree to a reform on the example of the Church of Scotland, though Vane cleverly affixed the saving clause "according to the Word of God." At the same time, parliament determined to establish an assembly of divines to settle the church question, but it carefully kept its control over that body and gave it no independent authority.

---

[49] See above, chap. vii.

[50] Marshall, Meroz Cursed, p. 52.

Thus, the Puritan ministry gained much for which they had been contending. Yet it is significant that the parliament's promise of a Presbyterian reformation and of an assembly of divines was not the result of a free act on the part of parliament. Only the threat of the king's complete triumph had induced the parliament to capitulate to the Scots. Under such circumstances the good feeling which had existed between clergy and laity during the early months of the Long Parliament vanished. During the debates on the Covenant in the house, Pym had defended the alliance on the basis of bitter necessity.[52] Such an attitude was not calculated to make for better relations with the divines.

IV

With the advent of the Westminster Assembly the latent strife between Puritan clergy and laity took a frank and open form. In part, this was due to the very considerable improvement in the clergy's position *vis-à-vis* the parliament. Secure in the support of the Scots and possessing in the Westminster Assembly a recognized sounding-board, the ministers were in a much better position to make their demands felt than they had been since the opening of parliament. On the other hand, the parliament, obliged to share its prominence with the Assembly and seeing its hold on the church seriously threatened, tended to become resentful and antagonistic out of a fear of ultimate clerical domination. Basic to all the rising passions, of course, was the fact that the moment had arrived when decisions on the future church settlement were actually being made.

---

[51] Baillie, II, 90. [52] Hexter, pp. 195-197.

Against this danger from the assembled ministers and their Scotch allies the parliament had attempted to guard. Certainly the members had no illusions as to the type of government that Presbyterianism would fasten on England. In describing the values of Presbyterianism, the Scottish commissioners had asserted that that polity had made "the Church of Christ terrible as an army with banners, and like a strong and fenced City, against which the adversaries have despaired to prevaile,"[53] and though not aimed against them, this description was not likely to reassure the Erastian members. Though hardly a Puritan, Selden expressed what must have been a typically parliamentary fear of Scottish Presbyterianism.

> Admit there be twelve laymen to six presbyters, the six shall govern the rest as they please. First because they are constant, and the others come in like churchwardens in their turns, which is a huge advantage. Men will give way to those that have been there before them. Next, the laymen have other professions to follow; the presbyters make it their sole business; and besides too, they learn and study the art of persuading. . . . .
>
> The presbyter, with his elders about him, is like a young tree fenced about with three or four stakes; the stakes defend it, and hold it up; but the tree only prospers and flourishes.[54]

The effect of this fear appeared in the growing anticlericalism of large numbers of the members, and the Scots and the ministers made the discovery that the most Puritan of English parliaments was also one of the most Erastian.

---

[53] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 298, quoting Reformation of Church Government in Scotland, p. 3.

[54] Selden, p. 156.

Throughout his stay in London, Baillie was disgusted with the shameless Erastianism of the parliament. "The most of the House of Commons," he noted, "are downright Erastians: they are lyke to create us much more woe than all the sectaries of England."[55] A short time later, he informed Scotland that the Erastians were a stronger party than the Independents.[56] He especially noted the prevalence of Erastianism among the lawyers of the house "whereof they are many, and divers of them very able men," who believed "no Church-government to be of divine right, bot all to be a humane constitution, depending on the will of the magistrates."[57] In 1646 a more discouraged Baillie was still singing the same tune. "This point is their idoll," he wrote. "The most of them are incredibly zealous for it: The Pope and the King were never more earnest for the headship of the Church than the pluralitie of this Parliament."[58] It must not be thought, moreover, that the leading Erastians were all "worldlie profane men"--to use Baillie's phrase.[59] On the contrary, many of them were the most celebrated of Puritan statesmen, and D'Ewes, St. John, and Denzil Holles all worked against the clerical Presbyterian claims.[60] What is even more striking is that John Glynne, the "Presbyterian" leader in the house, carried on a short filibuster against a measure favored by the Assembly. An account of this incident is given by Whitelocke. The Assembly presented the measure in the morning before the house was full.

---

[55] Baillie, II, 265. [56] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 307; see also pp. 267, 315.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 360. [59] *Ibid.*, p. 336.

[60] See J. H. Hexter, "The Problem of the Presbyterian Independents," *American Historical Review*, XLIV (1938-39), 29-49.

> Glyn stood up and spake an hour to the point of jus divinum, and the Presbyterian Government, in which time the House filled apace, and then Whitelocke spake to the same Points, inlarging his discourse to a much longer time than ordinary; and purposely that the House might be full, as it was before he had made an end.
>
> And then upon the question it was carried, to lay aside the point of jus divinum; and herein Glyn and Whitelocke had thanks from divers, for preventing the surprisal of the House upon this great question.[61]

Endowed with such a strong Erastian complexion, the parliament naturally attempted to keep control over the Assembly as much as possible. Legally, the Assembly had no separate existence; it was only an ecclesiastical committee set up by the parliament and responsible to it. This dependent character of the Assembly was clearly stated in the decree which established it. The divines, it declared, shall treat "of such matters and things, touching and concerning the liturgie, discipline, and government of the Church of England . . . . as shall be proposed unto them by both or either houses of Parliament."[62] The same point was expressed by Baillie a good deal more directly. The members of the Assembly, he wrote,

> have no power to write one lyne to any soul, but as the Parliament directs; neither may they importune the Parliament for warrants to keepe foreigne correspondence. . . . . Yow know this is no proper assembly, but a meeting called by the Parliament to advyse them in what things they are asked.[63]

And several months earlier he had even gone so far as to say that the prolocutor of the Assembly, William Twisse, was "among the unfittest of all the company for any action," and that "it was the canny convoyance of these who guides most matters for their own interest to plant such a man of purpose in the chaire."[64] The commons was obviously trying to erect safeguards against the "tyranny" of the clergy. In this they were acting in accordance with the spirit of Selden who had counselled the laity to "consult with the divines on all sides, hear what they say, and make them selves masters of their reasons."[65]

---

[61] [Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke], Memorials of the English Affairs: or, an Account of What Passed from the Beginning of the Reign of King Charles the First, to King Charles the Second His Happy Restauration (London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682), p. 106.

[62] Rushworth, V, 337.

[63] Baillie, II, 186; see also p. 202.

With all its efforts, however, parliament could not keep the Westminsters Assembly a simple committee of the parliament. True, the Assembly had no independent authority, and if it dared so much as to write to the churches abroad, it "would soon be taken up by the Parliament."[66] Yet once established, the Assembly provided the Puritan clergy with a platform from which they might make their collective voice heard. Moreover, the Assembly quickly gained prestige and soon became the focus not only of the clergy but of the city of London and of those ecclesiastical conservatives who were frightened of the excesses attending the disintegration of Puritanism. This enhanced prestige tended to give heart to the members of the Assembly, while the Scots commissioners never ceased to urge them to resist the Erastianism of parliament.[67]

The result was that a bitter struggle now took place between the Westminster Assembly and the parliament. The battle was not merely between the Presbyterian divines and the parliamentary Erastians, though these were the main contenders. The divines had on their side the Scots with their army and considerable segments of Presbyterian opinion throughout the nation. But the coalition opposing them was even more formidable. Not only the parliamentary Presbyterians and Erastians were arrayed against the Assembly but also the growing Independents and sects with their powerful ally, the army. The strife was to be one of principles, and in some cases the alignment cut across men's loyalties to the groups with which they were associated. That is to say, the parliament was not completely Erastian, nor was the Assembly entirely committed to a Scottish Presbyterianism. But the identification was close enough so that the battle between the principles became a contest between parliament and Assembly. Both Presbyterians and Independents recognized the essential Erastianism of parliament, and attempted to appeal to it in their controversial literature.[68] In the Assembly, on the other hand, the Presbyterian majority was troubled not only with the five Independents, but also with a few real Erastian theologians. They were not many--Lightfoot and Coleman were the most conspicuous--but, as Fuller noted, "Parliament-men listened very favourable to their arguments; (interest is a good quickener of attention!) hearing their own power enlarged thereby, and making use of their Erastians for a check to such who pressed conformity to the Scotch kirk in all particulars."[69] Yet on the whole the Assembly was overwhelmingly behind the clerical Presbyterian program, and however they might be listened to outside, they received only contempt and hatred inside the Assembly. "God hes stricken Coleman with death," wrote Baillie when the leading Erastian died, "he fell in ane ague, and after four or five dayes expired. It's not good to stand in Christ's way."[70]

---

[64] *Ibid*., p. 108. [65] Selden, p. 175. [66] Baillie, II, 202.

[67] See, for instance, Baillie, II, 221.

It seems clear that in order to frustrate the demands of the Assembly an alliance was formed between the Erastians and the

---

[68] Apologeticall Narration, pp. 3, 17, 19; Edwards, Antapologia, p. 158.

[69] Fuller, Church History, III, 468. [70] Baillie, II, 364.

Independents. Both parties had reason to fear a Presbyterian victory, and it was only natural that they should come to a temporary alliance. The Independents seem to have been especially shrewd in playing on the Erastians' fear of Presbyterianism--a practice which outraged the Presbyterian leaders. Edwards paid tribute to the Independents' thoroughness and activity in this regard. "You and your party," he charged, "have prepossessed the peoples minds with your principles, and have fil'd the City and Kingdome with your Tenets, and you have been on the prepossessing hand, filling many Parliament mens eares, and the peoples minds against Presbyteriall government."[71] It was the solicitation of the members of parliament that particularly bothered Edwards, and here Nye especially seems to have been at fault. On several occasions Edwards accused him of "dealing in private, under hand, and hand to hand with some men of note for the Church-way, and against the Government of the Church of Scotland."[72] And a little later Edwards puts his case even more clearly:

> And out of zeale of acting for your selves and way, have not some of you suggested in private to Parliament men, the prejudice of their Parliamentary power, if they should admit of the Government of the Church of Scotland; pleading also for a necessity of a Toleration, and in particular I aske Mr Nye if he remember no such discourses, and that at Hull.[73]

What here was done privately was soon acknowledged openly. At the very end of 1643, the Independents published their famous manifesto, the Apollogeticall Narration. Although it was primarily an appeal for sympathy against the Presbyterians, it contained several sly references to the imperialistic nature of Presbyterianism. "We had no State-ends or Politicall interests to comply with," declared the Brethren implying therein a contrast with the Presbyterians. "No Kingdoms in our eye to subdue unto our mould; (which yet will be coexistent with the peace of any form of Civil Government on earth)."[74] And somewhat later in the same work the Independents stated quite frankly that with regard to the "Magistrates power" they gave "as much, and (as we think) more, then the principles of the Presbiteriall government will suffer them to yeeld."[75] This was a hard agrument for the Presbyterians to refute, and when Edwards came to it in his Antapologia he failed rather badly.[76] Somewhat later, in the spring of 1644, Nye rose in the Assembly to make the same point with telling effect, though he nearly caused a riot in doing so. The infuriated Baillie gave a full account:

---

[71] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 233.

[72] Ibid., p. 217. [73] Ibid., p. 223.

> When it came to his turne in the Assemblie to oppugne the Presbytrie, he had, from the 18th of Matthew, drawn in a crooked unformall way, which he could never gett in a sillogisme, the inconsistence of a Presbytrie with a civill State. In this he was cryed doun as impertinent. The day following, when he saw the Assemblie full of the prime nobles and chiefe members of both Houses, he did fall on that argument againe, and very boldlie offered to demonstrate, that our way of drawing a whole kingdome under one Nationall Assemblie, as formidable, yea, pernicious and thrice over pernicious, to civill states and kingdoms. All cryed him doune, and some would have had him expelled the Assemblie as seditious.[77]

Nor did the Independents confine their appeals to Erastian sentiment to the parliament men or to the City, but seem to have made a similar campaign throughout the country. At any rate, we learn from Baillie that their propagandists in the shires were blending Congregationalism and Erastianism in their message. "In the countrie . . . . ," he wrote indignantly, "their emissaries filled the eares of the people, that the Assemblie did cry down the truth with votes, and was but ane Antichristian meeting, which would erect a Presbytrie worse than Bishops."[78]

---

[74] Apologeticall Narration, p. 3.

[75] Ibid., p. 19.

[76] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 158.

[77] Baillie, II, 145-146.

The result of all this campaigning was that the Independents and the Erastians seem to have developed an informal alliance and began acting in concert in the Assembly and parliament. As early as February, 1644, Baillie noted that though divided in principle, the actions of the Independents and Erastians had much the same effect, and a few months later he had progressed to accusing them of plotting together to wreck the Presbyterian settlement. It was the Independents and the "Civilians" who had "underhand" procured the parliament's alterations in the Assembly's paper on ordination.[79] This alliance was eminently successful in offering resistance to the Assembly, and as the sects and the army grew in importance and as the Scots' prestige dwindled, it became clear that parliament was not going to be obliged to grant a Scottish-type Presbyterianism. The forces marshalled against the clergy's aspirations were simply too strong. As Baillie wrote in discouragement in January, 1646,

> The Independent partie, albeit their number in the Parliament be very small, yet being prime men, active and diligent, and making it their great work to retard all till they be first secured of a toleration for their separate congregations; and the body of the Lawyers, who are another strong partie in the House, believing all church-government to be a part of the civill and parliamentary power, which nature and scripture hes placed in them, and to be derived from them to the ministers only so far as they think expedient; a third partie of worldlie profane men, who are extremelie affrighted to come under the yoke of ecclesiastick discipline; these three kinds making up two parts at least of the Parliament, there is no hopes that ever they will settle Government according to our mind, if they were left to themselves.[80]

---

[78] Ibid., p. 336.

[79] Ibid., pp. 198-199; see also pp. 357, 360.

[80] Ibid., p. 336.

Indeed, it is difficult to believe that the parliament was ever in serious peril of having to grant the Presbyterian program. It is true, that at times the Assembly could apply terrific pressure on the commons, but often this was dependent on the support of London and especially the Scots. In England itself, the Erastian spirit seems to have had the advantage both in national traditions and in actual strength. Certainly Fuller, who had reason to know, had no doubts as to what were the real relations that obtained between the parliament and the Assembly, and tells us that when the divines meddled in what had not been committed to them by parliament, "they were afterward staked down, and tied-up with a shorter tedder."[81] "And," he added a little further on, "seeing a premunire is a rod as well for a presbyter as a prelate, (if either trespass on the state by their over-activity,) though they felt not this rod, it was showed to them, and shaken over them, and they shrewdly and justly shent for their over-meddling."[82]

For a time, the clergy hoped that the accumulated pressures they were able to assert would be sufficient to bring the commons to capitulation. But though the parliament might temporize, it never seems to have given in on any important point. Even in one of the parliament's darkest moments, the members, when pressed, issued a declaration that "we cannot consent to the granting of so arbitrary and unlimited jurisdiction to near ten thousand judicatories to be erected within this kingdom . . . . by necessary consequence excluding the power of the Parliament in the exercise of that jurisdiction."[83] And in 1645 Whitelocke could compare Presbyterianism disadvantageously to prelacy. "I have heard here many Complaints," he declared, "of the Jurisdiction formerly exercised by the Prelates, who were but a few; there will be by the passing of this now desired, a great multiplication of Spiritual men in Government."[84] Perhaps most important of all these parliamentary pronouncements indicative of the vigorous Erastian spirit which animated it was the paper which the commons drew up in September, 1645, in response to a Presbyterian petition. The reformation, the commons declared, should "move from the Parliament" and "in a parliamentary way; without prejudice to the freedom of the Parliament while it is in doing . . . . whereby to the magistrate will be preserved his right and to the people their power."[85] And then in the most frank statement ever to come from the house, the members asserted: "Then might our enemies indeed scorn us as possessed with a spirit of giddiness, if having so lately . . . . taken all civil power from Ecclesiastical persons and pulled down the High Commission we should presently set up a Higher Commission or a power more arbitrary in every presbytery."[86]

---

[81] Fuller, Church History, III, 468-469.

[82] Ibid. [83] C.J., IV, 513.

When such feeling dominated the great Puritan parliament, it is not difficult to understand how the hopes of the Puritan divines were doomed to disappointment.

V

With the rise of a determined opposition to Puritan clerical aspirations on the part of the laity, the long awaited Puritan reformation was doomed--at least in the form in which the ministers had traditionally conceived of it. True, a sort of Presbyterianism was set up. The Erastians and Independents, as Baillie tells us, joined together in the houses to "keep off the Government so long as they were able, and when it was extorted, to make it so lame and corrupt as they were able."[87] To be sure, Erastian Puritans might regard this settlement as the fulfillment of Puritan hopes, and we know that Denzil Holles, the leader of the Presbyterian party and the "disciple" of John White of Dorchester, exulted at the "Dawning of a glorious Day, which our Ancestors hoped to have seen, but could not."[88] But, in reality, this "lame Erastian Presbyterie"[89] fooled no one, and even Charles was astute enough to distinguish between a Scotch Presbyterianism where "the Clergie will depend upon none" and an English where the clergy depended on the two houses without the king.[90]

---

[84] Whitelocke, p. 164.

[85] Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report 14, Appendix, Part 2, I (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1891), 299.

[86] Ibid.

But the political and religious anarchy had prevailed too long and even this mild church could not stand in the altered religious conditions of the kingdom. By 1646, Independency and the sects had well begun their phenomenal growth, and England was already turning into that great Amsterdam which Sir Edward Dering had feared in the early period of the Long Parliament.[91] Moreover, a new sort of anticlericalism was abroad, which took root especially among the sects of the economically and socially disinherited. It was an anticlericalism which struck not only at the power of the clergy but at the clerical office itself, and "priests" were soon being asked to make way for tinkers and cobblers. Implacable in their hatred of any type of Presbyterianism, then, the sects could not be expected to accept the parliament's church, and soon their time was come. Through their instrument, the army, the sects broke the parliament, destroyed the church, and gave official blessing to the religious chaos which had ruled England since 1640.

---

[87] Baillie, II, 360.

[88] L.J., VIII, 202. I am indebted for this reference to Hexter, AHR, XLIV (1938-39), 40.

[89] Baillie, II, 362.

[90] State Papers Collected by Edward, Earl of Clarendon (Oxford: Clarendon Printing-House, 1773), II, 260.

[91] Dering, p. 105.

At last, the great Puritan question of Tudor-Stuart England was settled. For slightly less than a century Puritanism had been steadily expanding, and throughout the period it had carried on a constant agitation for the purgation of Romanism from the English church and the establishment of a true Reformed Protestantism. In 1640 men thought the hour had come, only to discover that within Puritanism there was a complex of centrifugal forces which without the cement of Laudian repression could not be kept together. The multiple disintegration process to which Puritanism was subjected was final and irrevocable. "The swarme is up," prophesied Edwards in 1644, "and settles in so many places, as without Gods great mercy, they will never be got into one hive againe."[92] And though "one hive" might continue to excite the hopes of Englishmen for some time longer, the dream of a great national church based on Puritan principles was forever a thing of the past. Indeed, even if such a thing were possible, the lay spirit would have to be contended with. The whole nation, the Puritan community included, was shot through with a vigorous anticlericalism which closed the door for all time on clerical aspirations of any sort--a fact which Anglican ecclesiastics discovered when they returned in 1660.

The great divide was passed, and after 1660 and even more so after 1688, England turned to other things. But the marks which a century of Puritanism had left on English culture could not be so easily exorcised as had been the threat of a Puritan theocracy. A vigorous Puritan religiousness still flourished in the principal nonconformist bodies, and nonconformity soon formed one of the great continuing traditions of English life. Even Anglicanism was obliged to adapt large sections of the Puritan outlook for itself. But in a much wider sense, the Puritan spirit was perpetuated. The history of a movement the like of Puritanism could not easily be turned aside, and much of the Puritan mind and the Puritan ethic had been burned into the English character indelibly. Perhaps even the disintegration of the movement into sectarianism had furthered its influence. It may be that Puritanism in its atomized form was more readily absorbed by the culture. However that may be, it is certain that the spirit of Puritanism has been one of the principal heritages of English and American civilization in modern times.

---

[92] Edwards, Antapologia, p. 245.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographies and Catalogues

British Museum. Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts Relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration, Collected by George Thomason. Edited by G. K. Fortescue. 2 vols. London, 1908.

Davies, Godfrey (ed.). Bibliography of British History, Stuart Period, 1603-1714. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928.

Gillett, C. R. (ed.). Catalogue of the McAlpin Collection of British History and Theology. New York, 1927-1930.

Primary Sources

Public Documents

Great Britain. Journals of the House of Commons. Vols. I, II, III.

Great Britain. Journals of the House of Lords. Vols. II, IV, V.

Great Britain, Historical Manuscripts Commission. Report 14, Appendix, Part 2. The Manuscripts of His Grace, the Duke of Portland, Preserved at Welbeck Abbey. Vols. I, III. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1891-1894.

Great Britain, House of Commons. Members of Parliament. 2 vols. 1878.

Great Britain, Privy Council. Acts of the Privy Council. 10 vols. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1921-1938.

Great Britain, Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series. Edited by W. Noel Sainsbury. London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1860.

Great Britain, Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I. 4 vols. London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1857-1859.

Great Britain, Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I. 22 vols. London, 1858-1893.

Great Britain, Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy. Vols. X-XXVI. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1900-1925.

Books

Abbot, Wilbur Cortez (ed.). *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937-1945.

The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., during the Reigns of James I. and Charles I. Edited by James Orchard Halliwell. 2 vols. London: Richard Bentley, 1845.

Bancroft, Richard. *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the 9 of Februarie, Being the First Sunday in the Parliament, Anno. 1588*. London: Gregorie Seton, 1588.

Bargrave, Isaac. *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable Assembly; of Knights, Cittizens, and Burgesses, of the Lower House of Parliament: February the Last. 1623*. London: I. Bartlett and I. Spencer, 1624.

[Birch, Thomas (ed.).] *The Court and Times of Charles the First*. 2 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1848.

________. *The Court and Times of James the First*. 2 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1848.

Burges, Cornelius. *Another Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons now Assembled in Parliament, November the Fifth, 1641*. London: P. Stephens, 1641.

________. *A Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons Assembled in Parliament at Their Publique Fast, Novem. 17. 1640*. London: P. Stephens and C. Meredith, 1641.

[Burton, Henry.] *A Narration of the Life of Mr. Henry Burton*. London, 1643.

________. *The Protestation Protested: or a Short Remonstrance, Shewing What Is Principally Required of All Those that Have or Doe Take the Last Parliamentary Protestation*. London, 1641.

Cabala, Mysteries of State, in Letters of the Great Ministers of K. James and K. Charles. London: M. M. G. Bedell and T. Collins, 1654.

Calamy, Edmund. *Englands Looking-glasse Presented in a Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons, at Their Late Solemne Fast, December 22, 1641*. London: C. Greene, 1642.

________. *God's Free Mercy to England*. London: Christopher Meredith, 1642.

________. *The Nonconformist's Memorial*. 3 vols. London: Button and son, and T. Hurst, 1802-1803.

Calendar of Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library. Edited by O. Ogle and W. H. Bliss, under the direction of H. O. Coxe. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872.

Clarke, Samuel. *A Generall Martyrologie, Containing a Collection of All the Greatest Persecutions Which Have Befallen the Church of Christ from the Creation to Our Present Times*. London: Thomas Underhill and John Rothwell, 1651.

Cobbett, William (ed.). *Parliamentary History of England from the Norman Conquest in 1066 to the Year 1803*. Vol. II. London: R. Bagshaw, 1807.

A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts on the Most Interesting and Entertaining Subjects. Edited by Walter Scott. Vols. II, III, IV, V. London: T. Codell, W. Davies, W. Miller, R. H. Evans, J. White, J. Murray, J. Harding, 1808-1810.

Commons Debates 1621. Edited by Wallace Notestein, Frances Helen Relf, Hartley Simpson. 7 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.

Commons Debates for 1629 Critically Edited and with an Introduction Dealing with Parliamentary Sources for the Early Stuarts. Edited by Wallace Notestein and Frances Helen Relf. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1921.

The Complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D. D., Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge; Preacher of Gray's Inn, London. Edited by Alexander Balloch Grossart. 7 vols. Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1862-1864.

The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution. Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.

Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiasticall, Treated upon by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Presidents of the Convocations for the Respective Provinces of Canterbury and York, and the Rest of the Bishops and Clergie of Those Provinces. London, 1640.

The Correspondence of John Cosin, D. D., Lord Bishop of Durham. Edited by George Ornsby. "Surtees Society Publications"; London, 1869.

Debates in the House of Commons in 1625. Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner. "Camden Society Publications"; Westminster, 1873.

[Dering, Sir Edward.] *A Collection of Speeches Made by Sir Edward Dering, Knight and Baronet,/in Matters of Religion*. London: F. Eglesfield and Jo. Stafford, 1642.

Diary of John Rous, Incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk, from 1625 to 1642. Edited by Mary Anne Everett Green. "Camden Society Publications"; London, 1856.

Diary of Walter Yonge, Esq. Justice of the Peace and M. P. for Honiton, Written at Colyton and Axminster, Co. Devon, from 1604 to 1628. Edited by George Roberts. "Camden Society Publications"; London, 1848.

Discovery of a Great and Wicked Conspiracie against This Kingdome in Generall, and the City of London in Particular. London: Iohn Wright, 1642.

Dyke, Jeremiah. *A Sermon Preached at the Publicke Fast to the Commons House of Parliament April. 5th. 1628*. London: R. Mylbovrne, 1628.

Edwards, Thomas. *Antapologia: or, a Full Answer to the Apologeticall Narration*. London: Ralph Smith, 1644.

________. *Gangraena, or a Catelogue and Discovery of Many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and Pernicious Practices of the Secteries of This Time, Vented and Acted in England These Last Four Years*. London: R. Smith, 1646.

________. *Reasons against the Independent Government of Particular Congregations: as also against the Toleration of Such Churches to be Erected in This Kingdome*. London: Jo. Bellamie and Ralph Smith, 1641.

Eliot, Sir John. *An Apology for Socrates and Negotium Posterorum.* Edited by Alexander B. Grossart. 2 vols. London: Chiswick Press, 1881.

Ellis, Henry (ed.). *Original Letters, Illustrative of English History*. 11 vols. London: Harding and Lepard, and Richard Bentley, 1824-1846.

Firmin, Giles. *The Question between the Conformist and Nonconformist, Truly Stated and Briefly Discussed*. London: T. Cockerill, 1681.

Fuller, Thomas. *The Church History of Britain, from the Birth of Jesus Christ until the Year MDCXLVIII*. Vol. III. London: Thomas Tegg, 1842.

________. *The History of the Worthies of England*. 3 vols. London: Thomas Tegg, 1840.

The Godly Man's Legacy to the Saints upon Earth, Exhibited in the Life of That Great and Able Divine, and Painful Labourer in the Word, Mr. Stephen Marshal, Sometime Minister of the Gospel at Finching field in Essex. London, 1680.

Goodwin, Thomas. *Zevbbabels Encovragement to Finish the Temple*. London: Francis Eglesfield, 1642.

Goodwin, Thomas; Nye, Philip; Simpson, Sidrach; Burroughes, Jeremiah; and Bridge, William. *An Apologeticall Narration, Humbly Submitted to the Honourable Houses of Parliament*. London: Robert Dawlman, 1643.

Hacket, John. *Scrinia Reserata: a Memorial Offer'd to the Great Deservings of John Williams, D. D., Who Some Time Held the Places of L^{d} Keeper of the Great Seal of England, L^{d} Bishop of Lincoln, and L^{d} Archbishop of York*. London: Samuel Lowndes, 1693.

Heylyn, Peter. *Aerius Redivivus; or, the History of the Presby-*

terians. Oxford: Jo. Crosley, 1670.

________. *Cyprianus Anglicus*. Dublin: John Hyde and Robert Owen, 1719.

[Hyde], Edward, Earl of Clarendon. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, to Which Is now Added an Historical View of Affairs of Ireland*. 8 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1826.

The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes from the Beginning of the Long Parliament to the Opening of the Trial of the Earl of Strafford. Edited by Wallace Notestein. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923.

The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes from the First Recess of the Long Parliament to the Withdrawal of King Charles from London. Edited by Willson Havelock Coates. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942.

A Letter from Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus. 1643.

The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie. Edited by David Laing. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Robert Ogle, 1841.

The Letters of John Chamberlain. Edited by Norman Egbert McClure. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939.

Letters of John Davenport. Edited by Isabel MacBeath Calder. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.

Letters of the Lady Brilliana Harley, Wife of Sir Robert Harley, of Brampton Bryan, Knight of the Bath. Edited by Thomas Taylor Lewis. "Camden Society Publications"; London, 1854.

Marshall, Stephen. *A Copy of a Letter Written by Mr. Stephen Marshall to a Friend of His in the City for the Necessary Vindication of Himself and His Ministry*. London: S. Gellibrand, 1643.

________. *Meroz Cursed or a Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons at Their Late Solemn Fast, Febr. 23. 1641*. London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1641.

________. *A Peace-offering to God, a Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons Assembled in Parliament, at Their Publique Thanksgiving, Sept. 7. 1641*. London: Samuel Man, 1641.

________. *Reformation and Desolation: or a Sermon Tending to the Discovery of the Symptomes of a People to Whom God Will by No Means Be Reconciled*. London: Samuel Gelibrand, 1642.

________. *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons now Assembled in Parliament, at Their Publike Fast, November 17. 1640*. London: Samuel Man, 1641.

The Massachusetts Historical Society. *Collections*. Fourth Series, Vol. VI. Boston: The Massachusetts Historical Society, 1863.

Mather, Cotton. *Magnalia Christi Americana: or, the Ecclesiastical History of New-England from Its First Planting in the Year 1620, unto the Year of Our Lord, 1698.* 2 vols. Hartford: Silas Andrus, 1820.

May, Thomas. *History of the Parliament of England Which Began November 3, 1640.* Oxford: University Press, 1854.

Nalson, John (ed.). *An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State, from the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion in the Year MDCXXXIX. to the Murther of King Charles I.* 2 vols. London: S. Mearne, T. Dring, B. Tooke, T. Sawbridge, and C. Mearne, 1682.

Note Book of Sir John Northcote Sometime M. P. for Ashburton, and Afterwards for the County of Devon. London: John Murray, 1877.

Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords Officially Taken by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliaments, A. D. 1624 and 1626. Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner. "Camden Society Publications"; Westminster, 1879.

Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament, Temp. Charles I Printed from Original Pencil Memoranda Taken in the House by Sir Ralph Verney, Knight, Member for the Borough of Aylesbury, and now in the Possession of Sir Harry Verney, Bart. Edited by John Bruce. "Camden Society Publications"; London, 1845.

Notes of the Treaty Carried on at Ripon between King Charles I and the Covenanters of Scotland, A. D. 1640, Taken by Sir John Borough, Garter King of Arms. Edited by John Bruce. "Camden Society Publications"; Westminster, 1859.

The Pension Book of Gray's Inn (Records of the Honourable Society) 1569-1669. Edited by Reginald J. Fletcher. London: Chiswick Press, 1901.

Preston, John. *A Sermon Preached at a Generall Fast before the Commons-House of Parliament: the Second of Iuly, 1625.* London, 1633.

________. *A Sermon Preached at Lincolnes-Inne on Gen. xxij.xiv.* London: A. Crooke, 1635.

________. *Sermons Preached before His Maiestie, and upon Other Speciall Occasions.* London: A. Boler, 1637.

Proceedings Principally in the County of Kent in Connection with the Parliaments Called in 1640 and Especially with the Committee of Religion Appointed in That Year. Edited by Lambert B. Larking. "Camden Society Publications"; Westminster, 1854.

The Prose Works of John Milton. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Herman Hooker, 1845.

Prynne, William. *Canterburies Doome or the First Part of a Compleat History of the Committment, Charge, Tryall, Condem-*

nation, Execution of William Laud Late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury. London: Michael Spark, 1646.

The Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England. Edited by Nathaniel B. Shurtleff. Vol. I. Boston: William White, 1853.

The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn. The Black Books. Vol. II. London, 1898.

Reliquiae Baxterianae or Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times. London: T. Parkhurst, J. Robinson, J. Lawrence, and F. Dunton, 1696.

Rushworth, John (ed.). *Historical Collections*. 7 vols. London, 1721-1722.

Selden, John. *Table Talk*. Edited by Samuel Harvey Reynolds. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.

Spedding, James (ed.). *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*. 7 vols. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1861-1874.

State Papers Collected by Edward, Earl of Clarendon. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Printing-House, 1773.

Thurloe, John (ed.). *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq.; Secretary, First, to the Council of State, and Afterwards to the Two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell*. Vol. I. London, 1742.

Trevelyan Papers. Edited by Sir Walter Calverley Trevelyan and Sir Charles Edward Trevelyan. "Camden Society Publications"; Westminster, 1872.

Usher, Roland G. (ed.). *The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. "Royal Historical Society Publications"; London, 1905.

[Walker, Clement.] *The History of Independency, with the Rise, Growth, and Practises of That Powerful and Restlesse Faction*. London, 1650.

[Whitelocke, Sir Bulstrode.] *Memorials of the English Affairs: or, an Account of What Passed from the Beginning of the Reign of King Charles the First, to King Charles the Second His Happy Restauration*. London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682.

The Whole Works of the Most Rev. James Ussher, D. D., Lord Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland. Edited by Charles Richard Elrington. 17 vols. Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co., 1864.

The Whole Works of the Late Rev. John Lightfoot, D. D. Edited by John Rogers Pitman. Vol. XIII. London: G. Cowie and Co., 1825.

Winthrop Papers. 5 vols. Boston: The Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929-1947.

Winwood, Sir Ralph. *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I*. Vol. III. London: T. Ward, 1725.

Wood, Anthony à. *Athenae Oxonienses. An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford*. 4 vols. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1817.

The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham. 5 vols. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843-1855.

The Works of John Knox. Edited by David Laing. Vols. IV, V. Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1855-1856.

The Works of Joseph Hall, D. D. Successively Bishop of Exeter and Norwich. Vol. VIII. Oxford: D. A. Talboys, 1837.

The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D. D. Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. 7 vols. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847-1860.

Articles

Archbold, W. A. J. "A Diary of the Early Days of the Long Parliament," *English Historical Review*, XVI (1901), 730-736.

"The Autobiography of Thomas Shepard," *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts: Transactions*, XXVII (1927-1930), 345-400.

Stearns, Raymond Phineas. "Letters and Documents by or Relating to Hugh Peter," *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, LXXI (1935), 303-318; LXXII (1936), 43-72.

Secondary Sources

Books

Allen, J. W. *English Political Thought, 1603-1660*. Vol. I. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1938.

Andrews, Charles McLean. *The Colonial Period of American History*. Vol. I. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934.

Barclay, Robert. *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1876.

Brett, S. Reed. *John Pym*. London: John Murray, 1940.

Brook, Benjamin. *The Lives of the Puritans*. 3 vols. London: James Black, 1813.

Buchan, John. *Oliver Cromwell*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934.

Carruthers, S. W. *The Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Historical Society (of

America) and The Presbyterian Historical Society of England, 1943.

Coate, Mary. Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum 1642-1660. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

Dexter, Henry Martyn. Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years as Seen in Its Literature. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1880.

Dexter, Henry Martyn, and Dexter, Morton. The England and Holland of the Pilgrims. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1905.

The Dictionary of American Biography. Edited by Allen Johnson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928-1936.

The Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sidney Lee and Leslie Stephen. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921-1922.

Feiling, Keith. A History of the Tory Party, 1640-1714. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

Flynn, John Stephen. The Influence of Puritanism on the Political and Religious Thought of the English. London: John Murray, 1920.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. A History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War. 10 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.

________. History of the Great Civil War 1642-1649. Vol. I. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893.

Garrett, Christina Hallowell. The Marian Exiles. Cambridge: University Press, 1938.

Gooch, G. P. English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century. Cambridge: University Press, 1935.

Haller, William. The Rise of Puritanism. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Hanbury, Benjamin. Historical Memorials Relating to the Independents or Congregationalists. 3 vols. London: The Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1839-1844.

Henson, H. Hensley. Puritanism in England. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912.

Hetherington, W. M. History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1853.

Hexter, J. H. The Reign of King Pym. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941.

Hudson, Winthrop S. John Ponet: Advocate of Limited Monarchy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Hutton, William Holden. The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne. London: Macmillan and Co. Limited, 1903.

James, Margaret. Social Problems and Policies during the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1930.

Jones, I. Deane. The English Revolution. An Introduction to English History 1603-1714. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1931.

Jordan, W. K. The Development of Religious Toleration in England. 4 vols. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1932-1940.

Kirby, Ethyn Williams. William Prynne. A Study in Puritanism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Knappen, M. M. Tudor Puritanism. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Marsden, John Buxton. History of the Early Puritans from the Reformation to the Opening of the Civil War in 1642. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co., 1853.

Masson, David. The Life of John Milton Narrated in Connexion with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of His Time. 7 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1859-1896.

Miller, Perry. The New England Mind. The Seventeenth Century. New York: Macmillan Company, 1939.

________. Orthodoxy in Massachusetts 1630-1650. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933.

Mullinger, James Bass. The University of Cambridge. Vol. III. Cambridge: University Press, 1911.

Neal, Daniel. The History of the Puritans or Protestant Nonconformists from the Reformation 1517 to the Revolution in 1688. 5 vols. London: William Baynes and Son, 1882.

Newton, Arthur Percival. The Colonising Activities of the English Puritans. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1914.

Pearson, A. F. Scott. Church and State. Cambridge: University Press, 1928.

________. Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535-1603. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.

Perry, Ralph Barton. Puritanism and Democracy. New York: The Vanguard Press, 1944.

Pinto, Vivian de Sola. Peter Sterry, Platonist and Puritan 1613-1672. Cambridge: University Press, 1934.

Plum, Harry Grant. Restoration Puritanism. A Study of the Growth of English Liberty. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1943.

Rose-Troup, Frances. John White. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930.

________. *The Massachusetts Bay Company and Its Predecessors*. New York: The Grafton Press, 1930.

Rowse, A. L. *Tudor Cornwall*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1941.

Sharpe, Reginald R. *London and the Kingdom*. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1894.

Shaw, William A. *A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth 1640-1660*. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900.

Smith, Harold. *The Ecclesiastical History of Essex under the Long Parliament and Commonwealth*. Colchester: Benham and Company Limited, n. d.

Smith, H. Maynard. *Pre-Reformation England*. London: Macmillan and co. ltd., 1938.

Stearns, Raymond Phineas. *Congregationalism in the Dutch Netherlands*. Chicago: The American Society of Church History, 1940.

Stoughton, J[illegible] [illegible]. *History of Religion in England from the Opening of the Long Parliament to the End of the Eighteenth Century*. Vol. I. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1881.

Tanner, J. R. *English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century 1603-1689*. Cambridge: University Press, 1928.

Tatham, G. B. *The Puritans in Power. A Study in the History of the English Church from 1640 to 1660*. Cambridge: University Press, 1913.

Tawney, R. H. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1926.

Tindall, William York. *John Bunyan, Mechanick Preacher*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay. *England under the Stuarts*. London: Methuen & Co., 1904.

Trumbull, Benjamin. *A Complete History of Connecticut Civil and Ecclesiastical from the Emigration of Its First Planters, from England, in the Year 1630 to the Year 1764*. 2 vols.

Usher, Roland G. *The Reconstruction of the English Church*. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1910.

The Victoria History of the Counties of England. London: A. Constable and Company, Limited, 1900-.

Wade, C. E. *John Pym*. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1912.

Warfield, Benjamin. *The Westminster Assembly and Its Work*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1931.

Willson, David Harris. *The Privy Councillors in the House of*

Commons 1604-1629. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1940.

Winsor, Justin (ed.). The Memorial History of Boston, Including Suffolk County, Massachusetts 1630-1880. Vol. I. Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1880.

Articles

Davies, Godfrey. "English Political Sermons, 1603-1640," The Huntington Library Quarterly, III (1939-40), 1-22.

Hexter, J. H. "The Problem of the Presbyterian Independents," American Historical Review, XLIV (1938-1939), 29-49.

Hudson, Winthrop S. "The Scottish Effort to Presbyterianize the Church of England during the Early Months of the Long Parliament," Church History, VIII (1939), 255-282.

Kirby, Ethyn W. "The Lay Feoffees: a Study in Militant Puritanism," Journal of Modern History, XIV (1942), 1-25.

Neale, J. E. "Peter Wentworth," English Historical Review, XXXIX (1924), 36-54; 175-205.

Parker, Henry A. "The Feoffees of Impropriation," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts: Transactions, XI (1906-1907), 263-277.

Rowe, Violet A. "The Influence of the Earls of Pembroke on Parliamentary Elections, 1625-41," English Historical Review, L (1935), 242-256.

Seidman, Aaron B. "Church and State in the Early Years of the Massachusetts Bay Colony," The New England Quarterly, XVIII (1945), 211-233.